1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
2	x
3	ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS, DIRECTOR, :
4	UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND :
5	IMMIGRATION SERVICES, ET AL., : No. 12-930
6	Petitioners :
7	v. :
8	ROSALINA CUELLAR DE OSORIO, ET AL.:
9	x
10	Washington, D.C.
11	Tuesday, December 10, 2013
12	
13	The above-entitled matter came on for oral
14	argument before the Supreme Court of the United States
15	at 11:41 a.m.
16	APPEARANCES:
17	ELAINE J. GOLDENBERG, ESQ., Assistant to the Solicitor
18	General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on
19	behalf of Petitioners.
20	MARK C. FLEMING, ESQ., Boston, Massachusetts; on
21	behalf of Respondents.
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CONTENTS	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	ELAINE J. GOLDENBERG, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	MARK C. FLEMING, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondent	28
8	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	ELAINE J. GOLDENBERG, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Petitioners	57
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(11:41 a.m.)
3	CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument
4	now in Case 12-930, Mayorkas v. Cuellar de Osorio.
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF ELAINE J. GOLDENBERG
6	ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
7	MS. GOLDENBERG: Mr. Chief Justice, and may
8	it please the Court:
9	The Board of Immigration Appeals reasonably
10	interpreted Section 1153(h)(3) when it ruled that
11	creation of a new petition by a new petitioner did not
12	qualify as automatic conversion of an existing petition
13	to an appropriate family-sponsored category. That
14	interpretation is supported by the text and by the
15	structure of the statutory scheme. Indeed, it avoids
16	destabilizing that scheme by displacing waiting aliens
17	who have long had qualifying relationships with lawful
18	permanent residence, and putting ahead of them in line a
19	large number of adults, aged-out former derivative
20	beneficiaries, who have only just attained a
21	relationship with someone who can sponsor a family
22	member.
23	JUSTICE GINSBURG: But isn't there isn't
24	the effect on the no longer child much more severe? I
25	mean, if everybody has to get bumped down a little way,

- 1 it'll make a difference of months until they qualify for
- 2 a hearing.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: Your Honor, I don't accept
- 4 the proposition that it would only make a difference of
- 5 months, although I know Respondents have argued that.
- 6 It depends how many people --
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: Well, it's not going to
- 8 be 27 years.
- 9 MS. GOLDENBERG: I'm sorry?
- JUSTICE GINSBURG: It's not going to be 20
- 11 years.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: No, Your Honor. It won't
- be 20 years, but it could be years, and these people in
- 14 the F2B line have already been waiting for years to get
- up to the front of that line.
- 16 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What about all the time
- this one child has been waiting? It gets no credit for
- 18 that?
- MS. GOLDENBERG: I think it's mistaken to
- think of a derivative beneficiary as waiting in line and
- 21 being entitled to credit for waiting in line, for a
- 22 couple of different reasons. First of all, the
- derivative's rights are, as the name suggests,
- completely derivative of the principal beneficiary's
- 25 rights. If the principal beneficiary never becomes a

- 1 lawful permanent resident, never crosses the border into
- 2 this country, then the derivative gets nothing for the
- 3 time that the principal beneficiary spent waiting in
- 4 line.
- In addition, there are derivative
- 6 beneficiaries who, under any understanding of what it
- 7 means to wait in line, can't be conceived of as having
- 8 waited -- excuse me -- for the time that the principal
- 9 beneficiary has waited. And let me give you an example
- of that.
- In the (f)(4) line, someone could be waiting
- in the (f)(4) line as a principal beneficiary for, say,
- 13 15 years, and right as they're getting up to the front
- 14 of that line --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: What's that for? What's
- 16 that for?
- MS. GOLDENBERG: I'm sorry.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: For those of us who don't
- deal with this as much as you do.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: I apologize, Your Honor.
- (F)(4) is siblings of U.S. citizens.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: So they could be waiting in
- the (f)(4) line for 15 years, let's say, as a principal
- beneficiary; and then just as they get -- they're

- 1 getting up to the front of that line and their priority
- date is going to become current, they get married to
- 3 somebody; and the person they get married to has a
- 4 17-year-old child at that point in time. That
- 5 stepchild, that 17-year-old child, under the definition
- of child in the statute, will count as the principal
- beneficiary's child. And if, say, a year later the
- 8 principal beneficiary's priority date becomes current
- 9 and that principal beneficiary is entitled to immigrate
- 10 to the United States and become a lawful permanent
- 11 resident, they're going to be able to bring that
- 12 17-year-old or at that point 18-year-old stepchild along
- with them as a derivative beneficiary.
- 14 That stepchild did not wait in the line for
- the first 15 years that the principal beneficiary was
- 16 waiting. And so that example, I think, shows why, when
- you look at a derivative beneficiary, you want to look
- 18 at the end of the process; a snapshot in time of when
- 19 the principal beneficiary is coming to this country.
- 20 And what the statute says is, principal beneficiary, if
- 21 at the moment you're coming, do you have a child who
- 22 would be left behind in another country if you were to
- 23 come without them, if so, bring them along. But it
- doesn't make sense to look at a derivative
- 25 beneficiary --

- JUSTICE KENNEDY: So you interpret automatic
- 2 to include immediate.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: Well, I think that if -- if
- 4 automatically converted, in the context of this statute,
- 5 if that's triggered by a particular event, then it has
- 6 to happen as a result of that event, yes.
- JUSTICE ALITO: But your reading of this
- 8 statute gives (h)(3) a very, very narrow scope; isn't
- 9 that correct? And I just want to see if I understand
- 10 exactly how narrow it is. It would apply -- first of
- all, does it apply to any employment-based or
- 12 diversity-based petitions?
- MS. GOLDENBERG: No, Your Honor, it does
- 14 not.
- JUSTICE ALITO: All right. It applies to an
- 16 F2A petition filed by a legal permanent resident on
- behalf of that person's spouse; right? And -- and if
- 18 that -- if they have a minor child, then the minor child
- 19 would be a derivative.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: Right.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Benefit sharing.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: Yes. It also would apply
- 23 to a situation where an F2A petition is filed for a
- 24 child as the principal beneficiary, and the child ages
- out of that status. But I'd also like to say that it

- doesn't actually apply to all aged-out F2A derivative
- beneficiaries, so it's, perhaps, even slightly narrower
- 3 than Your Honor has described. It applies to situations
- 4 where they can be automatic conversion of the existing
- 5 petition and movement into a new appropriate category
- 6 without a change in the petitioner. And so for some of
- 7 the reasons that I discussed before regarding
- 8 stepchildren, it actually will be the case that some
- 9 aged-out F2A derivative beneficiaries --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Can you give me an idea of
- 11 how -- just to follow up on Justice Alito. Can you -- I
- don't know if you asked the IRS -- the INS this
- question; you may; something like it. Let's look at all
- of the derivative beneficiaries in the (f)s, (f)(1),
- (2)(A), (2)(B), (f)(3), (f)(4). And for the most part,
- they're grandchildren, they would be, or children,
- sometimes nephews and nieces. And now think of the set
- of all those people who age out. Okay? They started
- out as children, but it's 15 years later -- they're now
- aged out.
- Now think of that set. It's -- call it
- 22 a certain size. What percent of that set do you think
- are accounted for by the F2A people, who are the only
- ones on your interpretation that 3 would apply to?
- 25 MS. GOLDENBERG: I don't know what

- 1 percentage.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Any idea, any rough idea?
- 3 Because if you just look at it, one's natural instinct
- 4 is just what Justice Alito said. This is a minuscule
- 5 component of a set. It's much bigger, and therefore,
- 6 it's just unlikely that Congress meant (3) to apply to a
- 7 -- to a -- to a little molecule when there's the whole
- 8 ocean.
- Now, that -- that's the kind of argument
- 10 you're up against, I think, so I wanted to ask you that
- 11 empirical question. If you can give me any idea of the
- 12 empirical.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: Yes, Your Honor. Well,
- 14 before I get to the question of the numbers and I can
- 15 give you some numbers, although not perfect numbers,
- because of how records are kept in this area. I'd just
- 17 like to say that keep in mind that what Congress was
- reasonably interpreted to be doing here is picking up on
- 19 an existing regulation that was targeted specifically at
- this very group that we're talking about.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm going to let you
- 22 answer his question, but yes, they had a regulation so
- why didn't they copy the regulation?
- MS. GOLDENBERG: Well --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It would have been much,

- 1 much simpler to say this is limited to F2A beneficiaries
- 2 than to write it the way they did and say this is to
- 3 everybody who ages out.
- 4 MS. GOLDENBERG: There are two reasons I
- 5 think why they didn't copy the --
- 6 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Answer him, and then --
- 7 MS. GOLDENBERG: Okay. With respect to the
- 8 numbers on our -- in our reply brief on page 18 in the
- 9 footnote, we've given the best numbers that we were able
- 10 to come up with, and they are not complete numbers,
- 11 about people who are aging out every year for as long as
- 12 the State Department's been keeping records about this,
- which is not all that long. And you can see that
- there's a series of parentheticals there with respect to
- each year.
- The first number in the parenthetical
- 17 represents age-out derivatives -- derivatives in the F2A
- 18 category; and the second number represents aged-out
- derivatives in all family preference categories,
- 20 including F2A. And the numbers for these F2A age-outs
- 21 are not tiny; there are thousands of people a year. In
- some years, they are up in the 20 thousands, and so it
- is not necessarily a minuscule --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Did you ask -- anything
- 25 that would give me -- that's the total global picture.

- 1 That's the 2,000, 3,000, sometimes 10,000 aging out.
- 2 All right. But -- but the real relevant thing is if we
- 3 can get some idea, which seems in the paper, that your
- 4 interpretation applies to -- only to a subset of those
- 5 people. And just from reading it, that it's qualitative
- 6 reading it, it sounds like a tiny subset of those
- 7 people. Now, we can argue about whether that's for you
- 8 or against you. I think it's against you, but
- 9 nonetheless --
- 10 JUSTICE SCALIA: You do give the subsets.
- 11 It's not just the general, is it?
- MS. GOLDENBERG: Yes. There's -- I was
- going to say, the first number is the F2A, aged-out F2A
- 14 derivatives. So --
- JUSTICE BREYER: That's F2A. But we want
- 16 F2B now.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: No, I think F2A is what's
- 18 relevant.
- JUSTICE BREYER: F2A. You're right. You're
- 20 right.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: That's what's covered. And
- this is not a full universe of the numbers. These are
- 23 numbers kept by the State Department, but the State
- 24 Department is only responsible for half of the
- 25 administration of this program. There are also people

- who adjust their status to lawful permanent resident in
- 2 the United States and those numbers just aren't kept.
- We tried to get them and weren't able to.
- 4 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. So it looks
- 5 like it's between 10 percent and sometimes it gets it up
- 6 to 30 percent --
- 7 MS. GOLDENBERG: It varies, Your Honor. And
- 8 as I say, these numbers aren't perfect, but I think it
- 9 gives you a sense of the universe that we're talking
- about here to the best of our ability.
- 11 So if I could turn back to Justice
- 12 Sotomayor's question about why they wouldn't just go
- ahead and copy the language of the regulation into the
- statute and why they didn't just say F2A in the statute,
- 15 I think the reason gets back to what I was discussing
- 16 earlier actually with Justice Alito, which is that
- actually would have been overinclusive if they had just
- 18 said F2A beneficiaries are covered, because there is a
- 19 set of F2A derivative beneficiaries who don't benefit
- from the language of Section 1153(h)(3) because they are
- 21 the child of the petitioner's spouse, but they don't
- 22 count as the child of the petitioner, probably for a
- 23 stepchild kind of situation like I was discussing
- 24 earlier. If the stepchild is over 18 at the time of the
- marriage, they don't count as a stepparent's child under

- 1 the statute.
- 2 So there is a tiny corner here that would
- 3 get carved out. And actually Congress did a very good
- 4 job in this statute of capturing exactly the universe of
- 5 people that was captured under the preexisting
- 6 regulation. The preexisting regulation required there
- 7 to be another petition filed by the same petitioner, and
- 8 automatic conversion to the appropriate category gets at
- 9 exactly that same kind of result.
- 10 The other reason I think why Congress might
- 11 not have specified F2A in section 1153(h)(3) in addition
- 12 to just its understanding of automatic conversion as a
- term of art in this area that was doing the work that it
- wanted, is that section 1153(h)(3) now functions
- smoothly if there's a change in the family-sponsored
- 16 categories, which has happened in the past. Congress
- has changed up those categories, added categories. And
- 18 so if, for instance, Congress were now to add a category
- 19 for grandchildren of U.S. citizens, then aged-out F3
- 20 beneficiaries like Respondent's sons and daughters,
- 21 could automatically convert to an appropriate category
- and section 1153(h)(3) would work just fine.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Suppose there are two --
- 24 suppose there are two lawful permanent residents who are
- exactly the same except that one has a minor child and

- one has an adult unmarried child. So the latter files
- 2 an F2B petition and gets in line on a particular date,
- 3 right? Then the former, the lawful permanent resident
- 4 who has an unmarried -- who has a minor child, files an
- 5 F2A petition and gets in that line. But then by the
- 6 time the date comes up, the child has aged out and so
- 7 now you would say that would be converted to an F2B
- 8 petition.
- 9 MS. GOLDENBERG: Correct.
- JUSTICE ALITO: But the person would be --
- the child would be at a much lower point, right, than
- 12 the first one? Why would Congress have wanted that?
- 13 MS. GOLDENBERG: I don't think that's
- 14 necessarily true. It would depend on how the priority
- dates were working between when they were coming current
- in the different categories. I do think it's true that
- the aged-out F2A individual would go into the middle or
- 18 the back of the F2B line the way that the priority dates
- 19 currently working out.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Right. And the other one
- 21 would be higher up.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: Well, but they would --
- yes, I suppose that's true, but the person who ages out
- would be keeping the original priority date. So they're
- not entitled to more than that. And the reason Congress

- 1 might have wanted to put people into the middle or back
- of the F2B line and not right up to the front of the
- F2B, line, which would be the effect of Respondent's
- 4 interpretation --
- 5 JUSTICE ALITO: Oh, okay. I see. Thank
- 6 you.
- 7 MS. GOLDENBERG: -- is that that's extremely
- 8 disruptive to the line. And I would like to spend a few
- 9 minutes talking about that because I think it's
- 10 critically important here --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Ms. Goldenberg, before you
- do that, could I just ask you to respond to a sort of
- different hypothesis of what Congress was up to here and
- tell me what, if anything, you think follows from it?
- 15 Assume you think that Congress actually was not
- intending this very small category, that Congress was
- intending for this to be a pretty wide provision, but
- 18 what Congress was -- it was laboring under a
- misapprehension. I mean, it thought that you could do
- this kind of automatic conversion with respect to all of
- 21 these people, and it turns out Congress was just utterly
- 22 wrong on that.
- So -- but Congress includes this language
- 24 about automatic conversion. So what do I do if I
- 25 basically have a hunch that that's what Congress was

- 1 thinking, but yet the language that it adopted talks
- 2 about automatic conversion, which is impossible for many
- of this category.
- 4 MS. GOLDENBERG: Right. I think it's the
- 5 language that's on the face of the statute that's
- 6 important and it's ambiguous for the very reason that
- you just gave, which is that there are a lot of people
- 8 for whom automatic conversion to the appropriate
- 9 category just isn't going to work.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Do you mean we can't
- 11 correct congressional mistakes?
- MS. GOLDENBERG: No, but I think in a
- 13 situation where the language is ambiguous the agency is
- entitled to deference, and deference is particularly
- 15 appropriate in this kind of circumstance. This Court
- 16 has said before that deference is particularly
- appropriate in immigration contexts, and I think if any
- immigration context is appropriate for it, it's this
- one, because very delicate lines have to be drawn here.
- 20 If someone is helped, someone else is hurt. And it's
- 21 something where you have to step very carefully.
- Otherwise there is going to be real destabilization of
- 23 the system.
- And just before I turn to that, let me just
- 25 say one more thing about what Congress was thinking. To

- 1 the extent that you look at the legislative history
- 2 here, there is no indication that Congress was thinking
- 3 that this would sweep broadly. In fact, there are many
- 4 statements on the floor about not wanting to displace
- 5 people who are waiting in line, which would cut in the
- 6 other direction.
- 7 So the destabilization that would occur as a
- 8 result of Respondent's interpretation would be many
- 9 people -- and we can't quantify exactly how many, but we
- 10 have reason to think that the number is quite large --
- 11 would come pouring into, in most cases, the very front
- of the F2B line and would hold it up for very
- 13 significant periods of time and perhaps even freeze that
- 14 line altogether.
- 15 Keep in mind that in that line there are
- only 26,250 visas available per year -- nothing changes
- 17 that -- and per country, there are only about 1800 visas
- available per year. So if you envision, say, 3600
- people from one country coming into the front of the F2B
- 20 line, every single person in that line -- that's at
- least hundreds of thousands of people based on State
- Department numbers and more than that probably if you
- had the other numbers, is going to wait for two
- 24 additional years. And if there are more people who come
- into the front of the line, all those people are going

- 1 to wait longer.
- 2 And the equities here are such that the
- people who are going to be pushed back really have
- 4 entitlement to stay where they are, and that's for this
- 5 reason: The people coming into the front of the line,
- 6 the aged-out F3 and F4 derivative beneficiaries, have
- only just, just moments before this has happened,
- 8 obtained some kind of qualifying relationship with the
- 9 U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident that would
- 10 entitle them to family-sponsored immigration. Prior to
- their parent, the principal beneficiary, becoming a
- 12 lawful permanent resident, they were just the nieces,
- 13 nephews, grandchildren of --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: So that -- that's an
- 15 expectation argument? I mean, I'm not trying to put
- words in your mouth, but is that the point you're
- making?
- MS. GOLDENBERG: Well, I think the idea is
- that the people who are going to be pushed have had
- long-time relationships with a lawful permanent resident
- 21 entitling them directly to family-sponsored immigration.
- They have been waiting in the F2B line, maybe for years.
- They've been separated from their parents for that
- entire period of time most likely. And what
- 25 Respondent's position would mean would be that these

- 1 aged-out F3 and F4 derivative beneficiaries would
- 2 basically experience no period of separation from their
- 3 parents, because they would --
- 4 JUSTICE BREYER: We don't have numbers on
- 5 separation from parents. We do know that these people,
- 6 the ones that would be caught on the broad
- 7 interpretation, have also been waiting for years and
- 8 years and years and years. They've all been waiting for
- 9 years and years and years, and it becomes hard
- 10 to choose among them.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: Well, I do think that there
- 12 are sympathetic stories on both sides, but --
- JUSTICE BREYER: You can find sympathetic
- 14 stories all over the place, and I mean -- all right. Go
- ahead.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: For the reason I gave
- earlier, though, I don't think it's right to think of
- derivative beneficiaries as themselves waiting in line.
- 19 I really do think that that's the wrong way to look at
- the problem in this case.
- The reason that aged-out F2A derivative
- beneficiaries get the benefit of section 1153(h)(3) is
- 23 not that they've been waiting in line. It's that they
- themselves have a relationship to a lawful permanent
- 25 resident that either did entitle them or would entitle

- 1 them to be a principal beneficiary in their own right.
- JUSTICE ALITO: Is your real quarrel here
- with the idea of an appropriate category or with the
- 4 automatic conversion? On the Respondent's view, why
- 5 isn't there an automatic conversion? Because they say
- 6 that as soon as the person ages out they can be moved
- 7 into -- into another category. That sounds like it's
- 8 automatic.
- 9 MS. GOLDENBERG: I do think you have to look
- 10 at the phrase as a whole, but I also don't think that
- 11 that's what Respondents are arguing. They are arguing
- 12 that --
- JUSTICE ALITO: Well, why isn't it
- 14 automatic?
- MS. GOLDENBERG: Well, I think it's not
- 16 automatic because at the moment -- let me step back and
- say I think there are two different problems with
- 18 Respondent's position. One is the question of whether
- 19 you can ever have automatic conversion to an appropriate
- 20 category of an existing petition when you're subbing in
- someone new as the petitioner. So that's one issue.
- 22 And then there's a separate issue --
- JUSTICE ALITO: Automatic just means
- something occurs without anybody having to initiate the
- 25 change.

- 1 MS. GOLDENBERG: That's true.
- JUSTICE ALITO: So why isn't there --
- 3 why isn't it automatic here?
- 4 MS. GOLDENBERG: Well, I think that, with
- 5 respect to the issue that I was just talking about,
- 6 which is the question of whether you can ever convert a
- 7 petition to -- make a petition by itself required. Do
- 8 you have to go to the new petitioner, the parent and say
- 9 would you like to petition? Do you have to check that
- 10 person? Keep in mind, they've never been checked at the
- 11 beginning of this process when petitions are evaluated
- and approved to see if they qualify to be a petitioner.
- 13 For instance, to be a petitioner, you can't have
- committed certain crimes against minors. And that will
- 15 never have happened here.
- So if you have to stop and do that check at
- that stage as well, then it's starting to look a lot
- 18 less automatic. Then there's a separate question, as I
- 19 say, even if you did think that the statute could
- unambiguously be read to say that you can take a
- 21 petition by someone's grandparent and make it into a
- 22 petition by someone's parent. There's a separate timing
- 23 question that the parties are disputing here as well,
- and that the board ruled on in its decision in Wang, and
- 25 that is, what is the moment when automatic conversion is

- 1 supposed to take place.
- 2 Respondent's argument is that it's supposed
- 3 to take place at whatever time the derivative
- 4 beneficiary is interviewed, essentially at the very end
- of the process. A consular interview or an adjustment
- of status interview or evaluation, and that that's when
- 7 automatic conversion ought to happen. But what the
- 8 board said, and I think quite recently, is something
- 9 different, which is, the statute gives you a date,
- 10 Section 1153(h)(1) gives you a date as of which you are
- 11 supposed to evaluate the derivative beneficiary's age,
- 12 and that's the date that the visa number becomes
- available to a parent.
- 14 JUSTICE KAGAN: I understand that argument,
- but that's not the argument that Wang made, is it? Wang
- 16 suggested that if the -- the appropriate date was at the
- very date of aging out. So -- so it seems as though you
- 18 shouldn't be entitled to Chevron deference on that
- 19 question, given what Wang said about it.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: I don't think that's true,
- 21 Your Honor. I think, as I read Wang in any event, that
- 22 it says on page 33 you get automatic conversion if the
- beneficiary is 21 years or older pursuant to (h)(1), and
- then later in the decision on page 35, it talks about
- 25 the moment the beneficiary aged out. But that I take it

- 1 to be referring back to the (h)(1) determination that's
- been made. So it's aged out not biologically in the
- 3 sense of turning 21 and celebrating your 21st birthday,
- 4 but becoming 21 -- over 21 -- 21 or over under (h)(1) as
- of that date that the visa number becomes available to
- 6 the parent.
- 7 I think that's how Wang is best interpreted.
- 8 There may be separate questions about whether people are
- 9 entitled to the protections of (h)(1), but those aren't
- 10 being raised in this case, and that's not something that
- 11 Wang itself ruled on.
- 12 And so I do think that there's a reasonable
- reading of the statute that says, getting back to the
- question of automatically, the moment, the key moment is
- the moment that you're evaluating derivative
- beneficiary's age as of. And as of that date, they're
- either under 21 and they can be treated as a child for
- the rest of the process, or they're 21 or over, and you
- 19 got to figure out what can you do with them.
- 20 Can they be automatically converted to an
- 21 appropriate category or can they not? And if not, then
- they're out of luck. And that is a way of reading the
- 23 statute that makes it a very smooth movement from one
- 24 category to another without any kind of gap in
- eligibility. And it's a reasonable reading of the

- 1 statute. So as I say, I think Respondents really do
- 2 have two --
- JUSTICE BREYER: What do we do with a
- 4 reasonable reading of the statute? I looked at the
- 5 board's opinion here, and it seems to me in the two
- 6 paragraphs just prior to Section 5, at the end of
- 7 Section 4, they have as a critical step in their -- in
- 8 reaching their conclusion, their belief that the
- 9 legislative record demonstrates a clear concern on the
- 10 part of Congress to ameliorate the delays associating
- with the process of the visa processing. And they say
- 12 the same thing in the paragraph just above that.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: Yes, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE BREYER: So that's what they think
- 15 this statute is about. But that statute -- that problem
- is taken care of in (1)(b). And so the question would
- be, if that problem, which subtracts all the days that
- there was a processing delay, is taken care of on
- (1)(b), they can't be right that that was the purpose of
- 20 3.
- 21 So unless you can say to me how that could
- possibly be right, that reasoning, then what we should
- 23 do, I quess, if we think that you have authority in the
- 24 government to interpret this minor part of the statute,
- which I do, is generate. Send it back. And -- and

- 1 maybe give them -- say you ought to do this again
- because the reason you gave is not good. Or why not?
- 3 MS. GOLDENBERG: I don't think there's a
- 4 problem with the reason they gave, and I would like to
- 5 explain why, but even if there were a problem with the
- 6 reason they gave, I don't think that it would
- 7 appropriate to send it back. And let me talk about each
- 8 of those.
- 9 With respect to the reasoning on the
- 10 legislative history, the way that I read the board
- decision is totally consistent with my own reading of
- 12 legislative history, which is to say that Congress's
- overwhelming concern and the thing that Congress talked
- 14 about by far the most in the fairly sparse legislative
- history here, there's no pertinent report really, there
- are just a couple of days of debate. And the thing that
- 17 Congress talked about the most was the administrative
- 18 delays. That was Congress's overarching concern.
- 19 And Congress didn't really talk about
- 20 (h)(3). They didn't really say what they were doing
- 21 there. They didn't really say what they were getting up
- 22 to. And so I think under those circumstances, the board
- is reasonable in saying it makes sense to think that
- what Congress was doing was not some kind of big change
- and destabilization of the whole immigrant visa system

- 1 in the way that I described earlier.
- 2 It was doing something pretty small. And it
- 3 was taking an existing regulation and putting it into
- 4 the statute. And by doing that, it could be certain
- 5 that it wasn't going to cause disruption. And It wasn't
- 6 going to upset --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That is strange because
- 8 I look at (h)(3), which talks about automatic conversion
- 9 of battered spouses, of widowed spouses, and I think
- under your reading, you're basically saying Congress was
- 11 not intending to let those people jump the line. Am I
- 12 correct?
- MS. GOLDENBERG: No, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Because you have to
- 15 change names?
- MS. GOLDENBERG: No.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Oh, there's automatic --
- MS. GOLDENBERG: There -- There is automatic
- 19 conversion for self-petitioners and their derivatives.
- 20 It's provided for in a provision that preexisted the
- 21 Child Status Protection Act, and a very complete and
- 22 total age-out protection is provided in that --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So why did Congress need
- to add (h) -- (h)(4), using exactly the same language
- 25 that it used for (h)(3)?

- MS. GOLDENBERG: Well, Congress --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: That they -- that they
- 3 were entitled to the same benefits of automatic
- 4 conversion as (h)(3).
- 5 MS. GOLDENBERG: Congress added (h)(4) a
- 6 couple of years after the Child Status Protection Act, I
- 7 think, basically just to ensure that battered women,
- 8 people who are subject to abuse, could get whatever
- 9 benefit the Child Status Protection Act offered them,
- 10 even though they already had this other, very good
- 11 protection that I'm talking about against aging out in
- 12 Section 1154 (a)(1)(d)(1), (1) and (3).
- But in addition, it is possible to envision
- 14 a situation where a self-petitioner could qualify under
- 15 Section 1153 (h)(3). I don't know that anyone would
- 16 ever go that route, because they have this other
- provision that they can rely on. But if you think of a
- 18 self-petitioner who is the child of an abuser that's,
- 19 like an F2A --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: So you can have
- 21 automatic --
- MS. GOLDBERG: Exactly.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You can have automatic
- 24 conversion only in the situations that give you other --
- other statutes.

- 1 MS. GOLDENBERG: If I could reserve the
- 2 remainder of my time. Thank you.
- 3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 4 Mr. Fleming.
- 5 ORAL ARGUMENT BY MARK C. FLEMING
- 6 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENTS
- 7 MR. FLEMING: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
- 8 please the Court:
- 9 The government began at Step 2 of Chevron,
- 10 but I would submit that this case can and should be
- 11 resolved at Step 1. The government is asking this Court
- 12 to read the statute in a highly disfavored way such that
- it is not harmonious but at war with itself, and nothing
- in the language requires that. In fact, I would
- 15 recommend that the Court turn to the back page of the
- 16 government's brief where the statute is actually set
- 17 forth.
- And we can see that provision (h)(3)
- 19 consists of one sentence, and that sentence consists of
- 20 two parts separated by a comma. Before the comma, the
- 21 language sets forth one and only one eligibility
- 22 criterion. After the comma, the language sets forth two
- things that shall be done if the eligibility criterion
- is satisfied.
- Now, importantly, the government does not

- 1 contend that there is any ambiguity in the language
- 2 before the comma. Everyone agrees that it contemplates
- 3 and includes all derivative beneficiaries. There's no
- 4 dispute about that. And a bedrock rule at the Step 1
- 5 inquiry is that the Court reads the statute as a
- 6 harmonious whole. That goes double when we're talking
- 7 about a single sentence. So if there is a possible
- 8 reading of this sentence that is harmonious with the
- 9 clear opening clause that applies to all derivative
- 10 beneficiaries under Step 1 of Chevron, that is the
- 11 reading the Court gives to the statute.
- 12 It's especially important here because the
- 13 precise question at issue in this case is a question of
- eligibility and scope. Who gets the benefit of the two
- benefits set forth, the two duties set forth by the
- shalls in the language after the comma. And Congress
- spoke to that directly in the language before the comma.
- 18 All derivative beneficiaries who have gone through the
- (h)(1) formula and whose age is determined to be over
- 20 21.
- Now, the government's claim of ambiguity
- here depends on asking the Court to read one of the
- benefits after the comma, automatic conversion, in such
- a narrow and limited way, a way not required by the
- 25 plain language, a way that even the BIA actually did not

- 1 adopt, but such that it is incompatible with the broad
- 2 scope set forth before the comma. The Court should be
- yery suspicious of that reading, because it is exactly
- 4 the contrary of the traditional tool of statutory
- 5 construction going back to Brown & Williamson and FTC v.
- 6 Mandel that says the Court reads a statute holistically
- 7 as a harmonious whole.
- For the government's argument to work, the
- 9 Court would have to be satisfied that we were in a
- 10 situation like National Association of Home Builders v.
- 11 Defenders of Wildlife, which is the only case that they
- 12 cite for their ambiguity claim, but there the court
- 13 faced two different statutes and acted at different
- 14 times that were clearly contradictory. You could not
- comply with both of them at the same time. You had to
- 16 pick one or other the other.
- And in that context, this Court said that
- opens the door to agency interpretation. So in order
- 19 for the --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Under your view, does
- 21 automatic conversion cover someone who has to filed a
- 22 new petition?
- 23 MR. FLEMING: Automatic conversion does not
- require the filing of a new petition. It obviates a new
- 25 piece of paper. That is the purpose. When the board

- 1 addressed what conversion --
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: So the way this works, you
- don't have to file a new petition?
- 4 MR. FLEMING: That's common ground between
- 5 us. Automatic conversion means that the old petition is
- 6 deemed to have been approved in a different category.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: But under -- under her
- 8 theory, the -- the petition is -- is still coming from
- 9 the same person. Under yours, it would be coming from a
- 10 different person. How can you -- how can you even know
- 11 that that person now wants this -- this -- this new
- 12 adult to come in, much less go ahead without a petition
- 13 from that person?
- MR. FLEMING: Well, a couple of points on
- 15 that, Justice Scalia.
- 16 First of all, if in the highly hypothetical
- situation that you have a parent who has immigrated and
- does not want an aged-out child to come and join them in
- 19 the United States, then it is easy for the parent the
- 20 lawful person to withdraw a petition. Also the child
- 21 cannot immigrate.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: It would file a petition in
- that person's name without that person's consent?
- MR. FLEMING: Well, the immigration, the
- ultimate moment of immigration, when the child comes in,

- cannot happen without the parent's consent. The parent,
- 2 under a provision that the government cites --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: And you're saying that this
- 4 automatically gives the consent of that parent?
- 5 MR. FLEMING: No, I'm not saying that,
- 6 Justice Scalia.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, you must be if it can
- 8 automatically convert.
- 9 MR. FLEMING: The conversion can happen to a
- 10 petition in the F2B category, but in order for a visa
- actually to be given and for the child to immigrate,
- 12 first of all, the child would have to provide proof the
- parent is, in fact, a permanent resident, and would also
- 14 have to provide an affidavit of support, under a
- provision that the government cites in its reply brief,
- 16 agreeing to support the child so that he or she does not
- become a public charge. That can't happen without the
- 18 consent of the petitioner. So if there ever were a
- 19 situation --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: I'm sorry.
- 21 MR. FLEMING: I'm sorry, Justice Kagan.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Please.
- MR. FLEMING: Well, I was just going to
- finish the thought. If there ever were to be a highly
- 25 hypothetical situation where the converted petition put

- 1 into the position of petitioner, someone who did not
- want the child to come in, there are plenty of off-ramps
- 3 that that petitioner can take in order to avoid that
- 4 outcome. So that is not an impediment to our argument
- 5 at all.
- 6 JUSTICE KAGAN: In the usual case, a
- 7 petitioner has to show a bunch of things, right? You
- 8 have to come in and say, I'm a legal permanent resident,
- 9 and, you know, I file an affidavit of support and show
- that you haven't committed any offenses against minors
- 11 and all of this stuff, right?
- But you're suggesting that we can just
- ignore all of those requirements that usually have to be
- shown at the threshold for a petition to be accepted;
- 15 isn't that right?
- 16 MR. FLEMING: That's not right at all,
- Justice Kagan. Certainly not that they have to be
- 18 ignored. There is an adjudicated petition on file by
- 19 the U.S. citizen relative, but in order for the child to
- immigrate, the new petitioner, the lawful permanent
- 21 resident parent, has to meet all those requirements,
- 22 which are assessed at the moment that the child's visa
- 23 application is adjudicated. That is also when the
- determination of the age happens under the child's
- 25 status for protection. That's where that conversion

- 1 happens.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Is that for F2A children
- 3 as well?
- 4 MR. FLEMING: I think --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: These steps, are they
- 6 applied to F2A?
- 7 MR. FLEMING: Derivatives, who age out?
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Not derivatives. I'm
- 9 talking about the children of spouses.
- MR. FLEMING: Yes, Justice. The answer is,
- 11 yes, Justice Sotomayor.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Everything happens at
- 13 visa issuance moment?
- MR. FLEMING: The visa application stage,
- the officer who is adjudicating the application has to
- 16 ensure the qualifications of the petitioner to make sure
- they actually are a U.S. citizen or permanent resident
- 18 entitled to petition, and the qualifications of the
- 19 beneficiary to make sure that they have met all of the
- 20 requirements.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Direct or derivative?
- MR. FLEMING: Yes. Derivative or principal
- inside the United States or outside of the United
- 24 States.
- JUSTICE ALITO: So you're saying that these

- 1 things would happen -- do I understand you correctly,
- 2 these things or most of these same things would happen
- in the cases in which the government says there is
- 4 automatic conversion?
- 5 MR. FLEMING: Most certainly, Justice Alito.
- 6 Yes, that is exactly right. And the issue of time -- I
- mean, I think maybe it's worth backing up and talking
- 8 about how we think automatic conversion is supposed to
- ⁹ function.
- What happens is, you have the petition
- originally filed, it gets approved, and then wait until
- 12 the visa number becomes current and then they each, each
- beneficiary has to file a visa application which gets
- 14 adjudicated. Now, that could be adjudicated in one of
- two ways, depending on whether the beneficiaries in the
- 16 United States or outside.
- Notably, if the beneficiaries are inside the
- United States, they go through adjustment of status, and
- there is no claim on the government side that there's
- any obstacle to automatic conversion at that point. Why
- 21 is that? Because they both go in at the same time,
- 22 parent and child. The officer always adjudicates the
- 23 principal beneficiary's file first. It will approve the
- 24 application, and then the parent becomes a lawful
- 25 permanent resident on the spot. And then nothing

- 1 prevents the officer from looking at the child and
- 2 saying, while I'm doing the H1 calculation, your age
- 3 turns out to be over 21 under this formula.
- 4 Nonetheless, I can treat your petition as automatically
- 5 converting to F2B because you are the adult son or
- 6 daughter of a newly minted lawful permanent resident
- 7 parent who's sitting right here.
- 8 No difficulty at all. Certainly no
- 9 impossibility.
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Fleming, to accept that
- 11 argument, don't you have to accept your understanding of
- what the appropriate date is? I mean, let's suppose
- that the government is right, that the date is the one
- that's actually specified in the statute which says the
- date on which an immigrant visa number becomes
- 16 available. At that date, the parent is not even going
- to be a legal permanent resident; isn't that right?
- MR. FLEMING: Two answers to that, Justice
- 19 Kagan.
- First of all, your answer to Ms. Goldenberg
- 21 was completely right, which is that is not the approach
- that the Board of Immigration Appeals took in Wang. The
- board thought wrongly, and the government now does not
- even try to defend it, that the conversion had to
- 25 happen, if at all, at the date that the -- at the moment

- 1 that the beneficiary aged out. That's what they say.
- 2 They say, Look to see which category the petition
- 3 converted to at the moment the beneficiary aged out.
- 4 That's on Page 35. They tried to defend that in front
- 5 of --
- 6 JUSTICE KAGAN: But let's assume that this
- is the right date, the one that's actually specified in
- 8 the statute. Can you win if that's the right date?
- 9 MR. FLEMING: It is -- well, we don't think
- 10 that is the right date. It's a --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: I know, but can you win if
- 12 it is the right date?
- MR. FLEMING: Well, I think at that point,
- the question then becomes, does the conversion have to
- 15 happen immediately at that time, or as long as it's
- 16 converted at some point in the future, are we still
- interpreting the statute in a harmonious way? It
- automatically doesn't have to be immediately.
- Now, we think it can mean immediately, if
- that's how the Court chooses to interpret it, and still
- win, because we think the determination happens when the
- 22 adjudication happens, which is when, under their current
- 23 procedures, they do the age calculations.
- But even if the Court disagrees with me on
- 25 that and thinks that the statute requires the

- determination to happen sooner, all that means is at
- 2 some point after the determination, the petition shall
- 3 be converted; but that doesn't mean it has to be done
- 4 right at the time of the determination.
- 5 I'd like to back up, though, and take on the
- 6 premise of the question, which is that H1 somehow says
- 7 the conversion in H3 has to happen on the date that the
- 8 visa becomes available, because that's not what the
- 9 statute says.
- 10 H3 does not say that the conversion has to
- 11 happen on that date. It could have said that. There
- 12 are regulations in 204.2(i) that specify when the
- 13 conversion happens as of a particular time or upon a
- 14 particular occurrence. Congress could have taken
- language like that and put it into H3. It didn't.
- 16 All that H1 is doing is setting out the
- particular formula that gets applied to determine the
- age of the derivative beneficiary for purposes of
- 19 Subsection (d) and it sets it out by having two -- by
- setting out two numbers that get subtracted.
- 21 First number is in H1(a). The second number
- is in H1(b). And the first number is the age of the
- 23 child on the date the visa became available, and that is
- reduced by the number in (b), which is the number of
- 25 days that the petition was pending.

- 1 Nothing in H1 says, You have to do this
- 2 calculation at a particular time. It just says, When
- you do this calculation, here are the numbers you use.
- 4 But the determination itself is a matter of agency
- 5 procedure and under their current procedures, it's not
- 6 disputed what happens -- this happens at the time after
- 7 the visa application has been filed and it is ready for
- 8 adjudication when the officer sits down, whether it's a
- 9 State Department consulate officer outside the country
- or a CIS officer in the country, sits down with the
- 11 applicant and makes sure that all the eligibility
- 12 criteria are met, including this one.
- JUSTICE BREYER: But how does -- can I try
- 14 an example because I think it's easier to --
- MR. FLEMING: Of course.
- 16 JUSTICE BREYER: All right. Imagine Steven
- is a citizen. His brother Charles is not. So under
- 18 4 -- and Charles has a son Joseph who is not. That will
- 19 help you think about it.
- 20 All right. So we're under F4. Steven files
- 21 a petition, the beneficiary is Charles. Charles has a
- 22 minor son Joseph. Visa is granted, et cetera, for --
- 23 not visa, you know, he's given -- everything is in order
- and now Charles has to wait about ten years or so. By
- 25 the time he gets -- at the time his number becomes

- 1 current, the number becomes available for the alien,
- 2 namely for Charles, at that moment, we calculate
- 3 Joseph's age and it's 24.
- 4 All right. So your idea is that Charles is
- 5 current. Everything is fine. He goes to the port or
- 6 the office, wherever he's supposed to go, and he brings
- Joseph with him. At that point, Joseph, since he's no
- 8 longer a child, has to come in under another category,
- 9 and that category is going to be, I guess, 2B because
- 10 Charles will be now -- and Joseph will be unmarried over
- 11 21, right? Am I right so far?
- MR. MITCHELL: I'm NOT comfortable referring
- to Your Honor by your first name or your brother by his
- 14 first name.
- 15 (Laughter.)
- 16 JUSTICE BREYER: This is an imaginary -- he
- 17 spells it with a V.
- 18 MR. FLEMING: Your Honor, has it right.
- 19 JUSTICE BREYER: Okay. Now, if I have it
- 20 right --
- MR. FLEMING: With one tweak, which is, I
- think you're positing that your brother and his son are
- outside the country, not going through adjustment of
- 24 status.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Yes.

- 1 MR. FLEMING: -- where the situation is a
- 2 bit different, because then --
- JUSTICE BREYER: All right.
- 4 MR. FLEMING: -- your brother would become a
- 5 permanent resident immediately. There's no problem
- 6 going to a port.
- JUSTICE BREYER: Okay.
- 8 MR. FLEMING: But for consular processing,
- 9 -- I think what would happen is when you go to the
- 10 consular office --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Yes?
- 12 MR. FLEMING: -- Judge Breyer's application
- would be accepted and the calculation would be done for
- 14 the son, and it would be -- all right.
- JUSTICE BREYER: All right. Now the --
- MR. FLEMING: You now no longer qualify as a
- derivative, because you are 24.
- JUSTICE BREYER: All right. But there is
- one thing missing. Charles has not filed a petition for
- Joseph. So what do we do about that?
- MR. FLEMING: What happens then is what can
- 22 happen already under the agency procedures, which is
- they deny Joseph's application without prejudice to
- reapplication within a year, which they can do. They do
- 25 it already. Judge Breyer immigrates to the United

- 1 States, he goes over to the port. He is admitted as a
- 2 lawful permanent resident, and the moment that happens
- and the moment Joseph gets proof of that happening, he
- 4 goes back into the consulate and says: All right.
- 5 JUSTICE BREYER: And doesn't -- doesn't
- 6 Charles as a lawful permanent resident have to file a
- 7 piece of paper called the petition --
- 8 MR. FLEMING: No.
- 9 JUSTICE BREYER: -- in which Joseph is named
- 10 primary beneficiary?
- MR. FLEMING: I mean, we have two arguments
- 12 on this. Our principal position is no, because at that
- point there can be automatic conversion from Your
- 14 Honor's petition --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Yes.
- MR. FLEMING: -- with respect to -- to an
- 17 F2B petition on --
- JUSTICE BREYER: But there is no --there is
- 19 no F2B petition, because Charles never filed it.
- MR. FLEMING: But that's --
- JUSTICE BREYER: I mean, yes; right.
- MR. FLEMING: He -- you don't need to a
- 23 piece -- that's where automatic --
- JUSTICE BREYER: That's what I want to know.
- 25 You don't need --

- 1 MR. MITCHELL: You don't need to file a
- 2 piece of paper.
- JUSTICE BREYER: We do all this, and --
- 4 MR. FLEMING: It's done constructively, and
- 5 that's what automatic conversion is. The petition is
- 6 deemed as though it had been filed for purposes of a
- 7 different category, and even in the situations where the
- 8 government agrees it applies, the F2A case, not only the
- 9 category changes; the principal beneficiary changes.
- 10 Because the original F2A position was for a spouse, it
- 11 converts to an F2B petitioner for the child or the
- 12 aged-out child. There is no reason -- now, the
- government asserts that there's something in the nature
- of the word "conversion" that makes it impossible for
- 15 the petitioner to change, that that is somehow a
- 16 barrier. Now, there's no reason to think that that's
- 17 the case.
- First of all, the BIA never said that that
- was the case. When the BIA talks about the meaning of
- 20 conversion in the Wang opinion, it says the conversion
- is used when, quote, "a visa petition converts from one
- visa category to another -- not a problem here -- "and
- the beneficiary of that petition then falls within a new
- 24 classification without the need to file a new visa
- 25 petition."

- 1 Nothing about the identity of the
- 2 petitioner, and conversion just means a transformation.
- 3 There's no reason that a change which can already, the
- 4 government agrees, involve a change to a different
- 5 category for a different principal beneficiary, can't
- 6 also involve a new -- a change in the petitioner.
- 7 Conversion isn't defined in the Act's
- 8 glossary. The INA has a detailed glossary in Section
- 9 1101. Conversion isn't given a special meaning. The
- identity of the petitioner is not mentioned in (h)(3) at
- 11 all, unlike the preexisting regulation, Justice
- 12 Sotomayor, which clearly did say that a new petition has
- to be filed and it has to be filed by the same
- 14 petitioner.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: If I understand you, the --
- 16 the parent will be deemed to have filed a petition for
- admission of this now-adult, right?
- 18 MR. FLEMING: That is correct.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: And -- but the parent can
- withdraw that petition?
- MR. FLEMING: If he or she would ever wish
- 22 to do so, yes. And the child cannot immigrate without
- the parent taking additional steps, most notably the
- 24 filing of an affidavit --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: All of this flows from the

- word "automatic"?
- 2 MR. FLEMING: From the phrase "automatic
- 3 conversion, "yes. And the fact that Congress in the
- 4 opening clause, before the comma of this provision, made
- 5 very clear that it is to apply to all derivative
- 6 beneficiaries, because it says if you go through the
- 7 calculation of (h)(1), which everyone agrees -- even the
- 8 vacated panel opinion Ninth Circuit agreed with this,
- 9 and even the government agrees, that (h)(1) applies to
- 10 all derivative beneficiaries. And if you go through
- that calculation and your age is still over 21 when you
- 12 come through it, then your petition shall automatically
- be converted to the appropriate category, and if for
- some reason, Justice Scalia, the parent has a problem
- with that, there are plenty of ways for the parent to
- stop the immigration of the child, although I've never
- heard of a situation where that might actually happen.
- One thing I would like to back up to, just
- because we have at Chevron step 1, and one of the issues
- 20 that this Court indicated in Brown and Williamson is
- 21 important for that analysis, is a modicum of common
- sense as to the manner in which Congress would have been
- 23 likely to delegate this particular question to the
- 24 agency. The question here isn't some interstitial
- 25 matter or some filling of a gap that Congress is not

- 1 likely to have turned its mind to. It is a foundational
- 2 question: Who gets the benefit of these mandates after
- 3 the -- the automatic conversion and the retention of
- 4 priority --
- 5 It's unlikely Congress didn't think about
- 6 something as basic as that; and if they did mean to
- 7 delegate that to the Board of Immigration Appeals, it's
- 8 a very strange way of doing it. Because --
- JUSTICE KAGAN: Based on -- another
- 10 understanding of Chevron is sometimes Congress writes
- 11 confusing statutes that point in two different
- 12 directions at once, and then there's a choice. Does the
- 13 Court make the best of it or does the agency make the
- 14 best of it? And the agency knows a lot about the
- subject matter, and especially this agency, and so
- 16 irrespective of whether Congress meant to delegate
- something in some very self-conscious way, this is a
- 18 confusing statute, it's a kind of the muddle. The --
- 19 the agency gets to do it.
- MR. FLEMING: I would certainly agree,
- Justice Kagan, as a general matter that the immigration
- law is confusing, but I don't think it's any more
- 23 confusing than other statutes where this Court worked
- 24 through and found the -- the ultimate provision at issue
- to be clear on the question at issue.

- 1 And here the question is who gets the
- 2 benefit of it? And we have an opening clause that is
- 3 undisputed in its meaning that covers all derivative
- 4 beneficiaries. We also have benefits, automatic
- 5 conversion, retention priority date, that clearly can be
- 6 applied -- possibly, not only possibly, but easily -- to
- 7 the full scope set out in the clause before the comma.
- 8 And we have an omission, presumably
- 9 deliberate, of specific limitations not only in the
- 10 regulations but also in the V visa provision which we
- 11 cite, which specifically call out the very group that
- 12 the government now is trying to favor. If Congress had
- meant to say this only goes to F2A beneficiaries, it had
- 14 two easy example of how to do that. It deliberately,
- presumably, chose not to do that. As the Fifth Circuit
- observed and as the questioning earlier in the argument
- indicated, if all that the Congress was trying to do
- here was codify an existing regulation, it was very easy
- 19 for them to say so, but this is a ameliorative
- 20 provision. Even the BIA acknowledged that.
- 21 They were trying to solve a problem that
- happened when people had been waiting for a long period
- of time, and not just the beneficiary but also the --
- just not the derivative beneficiary but also the
- 25 principal beneficiary. I mean. The lead Respondent in

- 1 this case, Rosario Cuellar de Osorio, had been waiting a
- long time to emigrate with her husband and her family,
- and then when the time came, she was told you can all go
- 4 except Melvin; because he happened to turn 21 months
- 5 before the visa number became available. Congress
- 6 recognized that was a problem and tried to fix it. And
- 7 they did fix it, clearly.
- 8 That is the common sense reading of this
- 9 provision, that the clear language up front before the
- 10 comma sets out the scope, and that Congress meant the
- 11 remainder of the provision to be read consistently,
- 12 harmoniously, and holistically, as this Court has said
- 13 it always does, with that scope. Not to read it in
- tension, in some kind of irretrievable hostility with
- 15 itself, which is the argument that the Government needs
- 16 to convince this Court of in order to even get to Step
- 17 2.
- Now, of course, we do have an alternative
- 19 argument, with -- which is, you know, independent, even
- if this Court were to agree that our respondents'
- 21 children are not entitled to automatic conversion,
- 22 although we think they clearly are, that at the very
- 23 least there is another way to read the statute
- harmoniously, which is that they're entitled to the
- retention of priority date. That is the main benefit

- 1 that is provided by (h)(3).
- It's the benefit that is mentioned in the
- inactive title of the statute, and it's all that's
- 4 needed to affirm the judgment here.
- 5 And again, remember the standard. All we
- 6 need to show for our purposes to affirm the court of
- 7 appeals is that the language after the comma can be read
- 8 in a way that is consistent with the language before the
- 9 comma that sets out the broad scope of the provision.
- 10 It's at least possible to read the retention language as
- 11 an independent benefit.
- 12 Congress repeated the word "shall," meaning
- that it is an independent mandate. The object of the
- 14 mandate is different. It is the alien who retains the
- priority date, whereas it's the alien's petition that is
- 16 converted. And we know from Ron Pair that a statute
- that says that there is a duty to do A and a duty to do
- 18 B can be at least read reasonably and possibly --
- 19 JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, this is all upside
- down. I thought it's the agency that we deferred to.
- 21 If it can be read in the way the agency wants, we affirm
- the agency's position.
- MR. FLEMING: That is --
- JUSTICE SCALIA: You're saying that's not
- true, that if it can be read the way the court of

- 1 appeals would like it to be read, we must affirm the
- 2 court of appeals on it.
- MR. FLEMING: This is a important question,
- 4 Justice Scalia. I want to make sure --
- 5 JUSTICE SCALIA: It sure is. I never heard
- 6 of that proposition.
- 7 MR. FLEMING: What I have been -- what I
- 8 have been trying to note is the fact that what we're
- 9 talking about here is a statute that the Government is
- trying to argue is hopelessly internally inconsistent.
- 11 That is a Step 1 argument that we think gets rejected at
- 12 Step 1 because the statute can be read holistically and
- 13 harmoniously.
- 14 And if there is any possible reading -- this
- is the language of Brown & Williamson and FTC versus
- 16 Mandel -- if the benefits after the comma can be read in
- a way that is consistent with the broad scope that
- 18 Congress said this statute is to apply to, that is the
- 19 reading to be given.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: That would depend entirely
- 21 upon how much weight you want to give to the word
- 22 "automatically." I frankly find it hard to think that
- all the things that you say are going to happen flow
- from the word "automatic." And once you have a more
- 25 narrow view of automatically, it isn't -- you're

- 1 holistic argument does not carry the day and you're left
- with an ambiguity that it seems to me we would defer to
- 3 the agency on, not -- not to the Ninth Circuit.
- 4 MR. FLEMING: This -- I'm not seeking
- 5 deference to the Ninth Circuit by any means, Justice
- 6 Scalia. I'm seeking defences to Congress and its plain
- 7 language. And that's precisely the point.
- Now, going back to "automatic," since Your
- 9 Honor wanted to focus on that. I mean, "automatic" just
- 10 means it happens without any further interaction by the
- 11 -- by the alien. All it means in the regulations is
- that the agency regards the petition as being approved
- in a different category. And that certainly can happen
- in our case. The government doesn't actually dispute
- that it happens in the adjustment of status context.
- 16 They just argue that somehow the difference in
- petitioner is relevant.
- JUSTICE KENNEDY: Suppose -- suppose
- 19 everybody knows that for the group that's covered by the
- Ninth Circuit's opinion, the nephews, that there's going
- 21 to be a 3 or 4-year wait. Doesn't a new petition have
- 22 to be filed so that BIA knows that this person's in
- 23 line?
- MR. FLEMING: What -- what fundamentally
- happens is that the petition gets filed by the U.S.

- 1 citizen relative, and then after it's approved just by
- 2 basically checking that the relative is entitled to file
- 3 that petition, then everybody awaits until the
- 4 petition -- until the priority date of the beneficiary
- 5 becomes current according to the State Department lines.
- 6 It's not as though there's a constantly re-updating to
- 7 see if anyone has aged out or anyone has naturalized or
- 8 anyone's gotten married or anything like that.
- 9 If somebody wants to do that, then obviously
- they can send something in. But it's not as though
- there is a continuous updating of the file, until the
- 12 time comes when a visa application is submitted. And
- when a visa application is submitted, then it is
- 14 adjudicated and then all of these things are checked and
- the determination of age under age one happens, and that
- is the point where the automatic conversion is going to
- happen.
- And as long as that happens while the parent
- 19 is already a lawful permanent resident, there is no
- obstacle to conversion and no obstacle to it being
- 21 automatic, because nothing else needs to be done. All
- that has to happen is the officer has to regard it as
- 23 having been approved in the --
- JUSTICE BREYER: Can I ask you a quick
- 25 question --

- 1 MR. FLEMING: Yes.
- 2 JUSTICE BREYER: -- about your alternative
- 3 argument with you and Justice Scalia. I take it your
- 4 argument is: Look at the words; the part before the
- 5 comma defines a group and that group is not in dispute.
- 6 It's all the F derivatives.
- 7 MR. FLEMING: Yes.
- JUSTICE BREYER: All right. Then look at
- 9 the first part. It says the petition shall
- 10 automatically be converted.
- MR. FLEMING: Yes.
- 12 JUSTICE BREYER: See, if I lose on that,
- then look at the second part. It says, the alien shall
- 14 retain the original priority date. And you say as to
- that, that has an independent life.
- MR. FLEMING: That's -- that is --
- JUSTICE BREYER: So, it's either A or B.
- 18 And we think we win on A and B, but if not we at least
- 19 win on B. Now, has the agency ever expressed a view in
- 20 respect to whether you are right or wrong about your
- 21 independent B.
- 22 MR. FLEMING: I don't think so. The
- 23 government may think so, but I don't --
- JUSTICE BREYER: No. So wouldn't the right
- thing to do there be, in respect to B, send it back to

- 1 the agency so that they can express a view in respect to
- 2 that?
- MR. FLEMING: I think that's certainly --
- 4 JUSTICE SCALIA: How can you possibly
- 5 qualify for B without qualifying for A? How can you
- 6 retain your original priority if you have not been
- 7 converted to another category?
- 8 MR. FLEMING: The way the government --
- 9 JUSTICE SCALIA: That's quite impossible.
- 10 The two are obviously conjunctive and not dysjunctive.
- 11 MR. FLEMING: The way the government has
- 12 been applying this provision since its enactment, for
- over 10 years, Justice Scalia, has been to require
- everybody, even the people, the F2A beneficiaries whom
- the government is now contending are entitled to
- 16 automatic conversion, it has required them to file to
- 17 get a new petition filed. It has been denying automatic
- 18 conversion to everybody and it did that up through the
- 19 filing of our red brief.
- It was only after we pointed this out, a
- 21 week before the government filed its reply brief in this
- 22 Court CIS issued new guidance saying: Okay,
- henceforward, you don't need to file a new petition
- 24 anymore. As far as I know, for consular processing
- 25 cases they are still doing it the old way. You still

- 1 cannot get automatic conversion, but you do get to
- 2 retain your priority date.
- They are clearly implementable as separate
- 4 benefits. That is how this has been done over the last
- 5 10 or 11 years, until the government came time to file
- 6 its brief, its reply brief in this Court.
- JUSTICE SCALIA: Well, all that proves is
- 8 that you need either automatic conversion or the filing
- 9 of a separate petition. But you obviously need either
- one or the other of those two --
- MR. FLEMING: Yes.
- 12 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- before the B part, "the
- alien shall retain the original priority, " makes any
- 14 sense.
- MR. FLEMING: We don't disagree with that,
- 16 Justice Scalia, but we have new petitions that were
- 17 filed as a protective matter in these cases. That --
- 18 that's not a problem. These -- precisely because the
- 19 government was requiring everyone to file a new
- 20 petition, all of the Respondents' children in this case
- 21 have F2B petitions pending. We don't think we need
- 22 them. Our primary argument is they should have had the
- 23 original petition converted.
- But if for some reason this Court disagrees,
- we have F2B petitions there as to which the priority

- date can and should be retained. So either of these is
- 2 a sufficient basis to affirm the court of appeals.
- I haven't spoken much about Step 2 of
- 4 Chevron because I think it can and should be resolved at
- 5 Step 1. But I would like to address the question
- 6 that -- the response that was made in -- in response to
- 7 Justice Ginsburg's question at the beginning.
- 8 The -- the point about the categories here,
- 9 it is a natural phenomenon of these categories that they
- 10 are fluid. People are coming in and out of them at
- various times depending on naturalization, on marriage,
- on termination of marriage, as people adopt children, as
- people decide not to immigrate, as people pass away.
- 14 There is -- these aren't hermetically sealed categories.
- Also, there is no way to apply (h)(3)
- 16 without some kind of movement. Even the government's
- theory of (h)(3) means that some people are going to go
- out of the F2A category into the F2B category. And so
- the question is, under Chevron Step 2, which again, we
- don't think the Court needs to address, has the BIA
- 21 drawn a rational line here within this group of
- beneficiaries who are all F2B, all children of lawful
- permanent residents.
- 24 And the line the BIA drew is it says we are
- 25 going to say treat better people who have two lawful

- 1 permanent resident parents than people who have one
- 2 lawful permanent resident parent, often two, and a U.S.
- 3 citizen relative. Is there a rational line for that?
- 4 The BIA certainly hasn't provided one.
- 5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 6 Ms. Goldenberg, four minutes.
- 7 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF ELAINE J. GOLDENBERG
- 8 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS
- 9 MS. GOLDENBERG: Thank you, Your Honor.
- The Respondents were trying to put far too
- 11 heavy a burden on the government in the Chevron
- 12 deference case. So long as the agency has arrived at a
- reasonable reading of this very complicated statute, the
- 14 agency is entitled to deference here. And the
- 15 Respondents' idea that some kind of internal
- inconsistency is absolutely required here is wrong.
- 17 Automatic conversion -- the phrase about
- 18 automatic conversion is ambiguous, and it renders the
- whole provision ambiguous.
- 20 And let me address the idea that everyone
- 21 before the comma, everyone in the "if" clause of Section
- 22 1153(h)(3) necessarily qualifies here. That's not true
- under respondents' own reading, and it can't be true
- 24 because there are going to be situations where someone
- 25 has their age calculated as over 21 as of the date the

- 1 visa becomes available to the parent, and the parent
- 2 never becomes a lawful permanent resident. They don't
- qualify. They come to the border, and they are not let
- 4 through the border. And so in that situation, there are
- 5 going to be people who are named in that first part of
- 6 the clause who would not be entitled to automatic
- 7 conversion.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: What he's saying -- but
- 9 what he's saying is that's true of everybody. FBA, any
- of these categories don't get converted until the visa
- 11 is actually issued --
- MS. GOLDENBERG: No, that's not --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: -- until you go to the
- 14 consular order -- office and apply. That's true no
- 15 matter what.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: It's not true with respect
- to F2A derivatives, because they have an existing
- 18 relationship with the existing petitioner. They don't
- 19 need the primary beneficiary to become a lawful
- permanent resident in order to get automatic conversion.
- But the broader point is that we are talking
- 22 about --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: They can come in before
- their parent?
- MS. GOLDENBERG: No, it's not that they can

- 1 come in --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Their parent has to
- become a citizen and then they can come in, correct?
- 4 MS. GOLDENBERG: Yes, Your Honor, but they
- 5 don't -- to get automatic conversion, they are not
- 6 relying on that new lawful permanent resident. They are
- 7 relying on their existing relationship with somebody
- 8 else.
- 9 But the broader point here is we aren't
- 10 necessarily talking about a subcategory of people who
- 11 are deemed in that "if" clause who are going to benefit
- 12 from automatic conversion. There's another example, as
- well, in the diversity visa context. Diversity visas
- don't have priority dates. So it's awfully hard to see
- 15 the derivative beneficiaries of diversity visas who are
- named in the (h)2) definitional section are going to be
- able to necessarily benefit from Section 1153(h)(3).
- 18 And even if you did think that everybody had
- to sort of run through the 1153(h)(3) analysis, the
- answer you come up with with respect to certain people
- is it's a null category. There is no appropriate
- 22 category for them, so the category is nothing.
- I'd like to talk a little bit as well about
- the retention issue that Respondents discussed. And the
- implication of Respondents' argument is, as I think

- 1 Justice Scalia recognized in his question, that somebody
- 2 can get a priority date and just walk around with it,
- 3 even if there is no valid petition pending as to them
- 4 and even if their parent never becomes a lawful
- 5 permanent resident.
- 6 So that would mean that aged-out derivative
- 5 beneficiaries, under Respondents' interpretation, would
- 8 be better off than children whose parents never become a
- 9 lawful permanent resident. They would have a priority
- date somehow in their pocket that they could walk around
- 11 with and use 20 years later when somebody filed a
- different petition on their behalf, an employment
- 13 petition --
- 14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, it's not so
- odd to say they've got a priority date in their pocket
- when the statute says the original priority date --
- they'll retain the original priority date.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: Yes, but the statute is
- most reasonably read to say, as all other automatic
- 20 conversion provisions do, that they retain the priority
- 21 date if the automatic conversion is possible, so that
- there's a specific petition being identified that that
- priority date is going to attach to, and not that you
- just somehow have a priority date, which is, keep in
- mind, a filing date that you're just going to kind of

- 1 hold and walk around with and use it if you want.
- 2 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Hold or maybe
- 3 retain.
- 4 MS. GOLDENBERG: Well, but in a situation in
- 5 which the parent never becomes a lawful permanent
- 6 resident, that would mean -- that would turn the -- the
- 7 notion of a derivative beneficiary upside down. That
- 8 would mean that someone could, in effect, be a
- 9 derivative beneficiary and use that priority date in the
- 10 future, even if --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I am so confused. You
- 12 better unconfuse me, okay, on this argument.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: Sorry, Your Honor.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: It's an original date
- basically to the original petition, meaning there has --
- it is that that's being converted. If that hasn't been
- granted, there's nothing to convert. If that person
- hasn't become a citizen, there is nothing to attach any
- 19 change to.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: But Respondents' argument
- 21 is that you don't need automatic conversion, that
- 22 retention of priority date --
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You're talking about his
- second step.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: It's the -- exactly. It's

- 1 the separate step.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: All right. We're
- 3 talking about his second step.
- 4 MS. GOLDENBERG: You just explained exactly
- 5 why that can't be right because you do need something to
- 6 attach it to.
- JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: You're only talking
- 8 about his second argument.
- 9 MS. GOLDENBERG: Exactly. But I would like
- to go back to automatic conversion, if I could, and just
- 11 make a few more points. And one is that the idea that
- 12 Wang didn't say that the petitioner --
- CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You can finish --
- 14 finish that sentence.
- MS. GOLDENBERG: Thank you, Your Honor. The
- idea that the board in the matter of Wang didn't say
- that the petitioner couldn't change is simply wrong.
- 18 The board very, very clearly on page 35 of its decision
- 19 says that conversion means that you don't need a new
- 20 petitioner.
- 21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.
- 22 The case is submitted.
- 23 (Whereupon, at 12:42 p.m., the case in the
- above-entitled matter was submitted.)

25

		20.2.42.0	1	10.11
A	admission 44:17	agrees 29:2 43:8	applicant 39:11	42:11
a.m 1:15 3:2	admitted 42:1	44:4 45:7,9	application	arrived 57:12
ability 12:10	adopt 30:1	ahead 3:18	33:23 34:14,15	art 13:13
able 6:11 10:9	56:12	12:13 19:15	35:13,24 39:7	asked 8:12
12:3 59:17	adopted 16:1	31:12	41:12,23 52:12	asking 28:11
above-entitled	adult 14:1 31:12	AL 1:5,8	52:13	29:22
1:13 62:24	36:5	ALEJANDRO	applied 34:6	asserts 43:13
absolutely 57:16	adults 3:19	1:3	38:17 47:6	assessed 33:22
abuse 27:8	affidavit 32:14	alien 40:1 49:14	applies 7:15 8:3	Assistant 1:17
abuser 27:18	33:9 44:24	51:11 53:13	11:4 29:9 43:8	associating
accept 4:3 36:10	affirm 49:4,6,21	55:13	45:9	24:10
36:11	50:1 56:2	alien's 49:15	apply 7:10,11,22	Association
accepted 33:14	age 8:18 22:11	aliens 3:16	8:1,24 9:6 45:5	30:10
41:13	23:16 29:19	Alito 7:7,15,21	50:18 56:15	assume 15:15
accounted 8:23	33:24 34:7	8:11 9:4 12:16	58:14	37:6
acknowledged	36:2 37:23	13:23 14:10,20	applying 54:12	attach 60:23
47:20	38:18,22 40:3	15:5 20:2,13	approach 36:21	61:18 62:6
Act 26:21 27:6,9	45:11 52:15,15	20:23 21:2	appropriate	attained 3:20
Act's 44:7	57:25	34:25 35:5	3:13 8:5 13:8	authority 24:23
acted 30:13	age-out 10:17	alternative	13:21 16:8,15	automatic 3:12
add 13:18 26:24	26:22	48:18 53:2	16:17,18 20:3	7:1 8:4 13:8,12
added 13:17	age-outs 10:20	altogether 17:14	20:19 22:16	15:20,24 16:2
27:5	aged 8:20 14:6	ambiguity 29:1	23:21 25:7	16:8 20:4,5,8
addition 5:5	22:25 23:2	29:21 30:12	36:12 45:13	20:14,16,19,23
13:11 27:13	37:1,3 52:7	51:2	59:21	21:3,18,25
additional 17:24	aged-out 3:19	ambiguous 16:6	approve 35:23	22:7,22 26:8
44:23	8:1,9 10:18	16:13 57:18,19	approved 21:12	26:17,18 27:3
address 56:5,20	11:13 13:19	ameliorate	31:6 35:11	27:21,23 29:23
57:20	14:17 18:6	24:10	51:12 52:1,23	30:21,23 31:5
addressed 31:1	19:1,21 31:18	ameliorative	area 9:16 13:13	35:4,8,20
adjudicated	43:12 60:6	47:19	argue 11:7 50:10	42:13,23 43:5
33:18,23 35:14	agency 16:13	analysis 45:21	51:16	45:1,2 46:3
35:14 52:14	30:18 39:4	59:19	argued 4:5	47:4 48:21
adjudicates	41:22 45:24	answer 9:22	arguing 20:11	50:24 51:8,9
35:22	46:13,14,15,19	10:6 34:10	20:11	52:16,21 54:16
adjudicating	49:20,21 51:3	36:20 59:20	argument 1:14	54:17 55:1,8
34:15	51:12 53:19	answers 36:18	2:2,5,8 3:3,5	57:17,18 58:6
adjudication	54:1 57:12,14	anybody 20:24	9:9 18:15 22:2	58:20 59:5,12
37:22 39:8	agency's 49:22	anymore 54:24	22:14,15 28:5	60:19,21 61:21
adjust 12:1	ages 7:24 10:3	anyone's 52:8	30:8 33:4	62:10
adjustment 22:5	14:23 20:6	apologize 5:20	36:11 47:16	automatically
35:18 40:23	aging 10:11 11:1	appeals 3:9	48:15,19 50:11	7:4 13:21
51:15	22:17 27:11	36:22 46:7	51:1 53:3,4	23:14,20 32:4
administration	agree 46:20	49:7 50:1,2	55:22 57:7	32:8 36:4
11:25	48:20	56:2	59:25 61:12,20	37:18 45:12
administrative	agreed 45:8	APPEARAN	62:8	50:22,25 53:10
25:17	agreeing 32:16	1:16	arguments	available 17:16
			l	l

	-	-	-	
17:18 22:13	3:20 5:6 8:2,9	birthday 23:3	39:2,3 41:13	cetera 39:22
23:5 36:16	8:14 10:1	bit 41:2 59:23	45:7,11	change 8:6
38:8,23 40:1	12:18,19 13:20	board 3:9 21:24	calculations	13:15 20:25
48:5 58:1	18:6 19:1,18	22:8 25:10,22	37:23	25:24 26:15
avoid 33:3	19:22 29:3,10	30:25 36:22,23	call 8:21 47:11	43:15 44:3,4,6
avoids 3:15	29:18 35:15,17	46:7 62:16,18	called 42:7	61:19 62:17
awaits 52:3	45:6,10 47:4	board's 24:5	captured 13:5	changed 13:17
awfully 59:14	47:13 54:14	border 5:1 58:3	capturing 13:4	changes 17:16
	56:22 59:15	58:4	care 24:16,18	43:9,9
B	60:7	Boston 1:20	carefully 16:21	charge 32:17
b 8:15 24:16,19	beneficiary 4:20	Breyer 8:10 9:2	carry 51:1	Charles 39:17
38:24 49:18	4:25 5:3,9,12	10:24 11:15,19	carved 13:3	39:18,21,21,24
53:17,18,19,21	5:25 6:9,13,15	12:4 19:4,13	case 3:4 8:8	40:2,4,10
53:25 54:5	6:17,19,20,25	24:3,14 39:13	19:20 23:10	41:19 42:6,19
55:12	7:24 18:11	39:16 40:16,19	28:10 29:13	check 21:9,16
back 12:11,15	20:1 22:4,23	40:25 41:3,7	30:11 33:6	checked 21:10
14:18 15:1	22:25 34:19	41:11,15,18,25	43:8,17,19	52:14
18:3 20:16	35:13 37:1,3	42:5,9,15,18	48:1 51:14	checking 52:2
23:1,13 24:25	38:18 39:21	42:21,24 43:3	55:20 57:12	Chevron 22:18
25:7 28:15	42:10 43:9,23	52:24 53:2,8	62:22,23	28:9 29:10
30:5 38:5 42:4	44:5 47:23,24	53:12,17,24	cases 17:11 35:3	45:19 46:10
45:18 51:8	47:25 52:4	Breyer's 41:12	54:25 55:17	56:4,19 57:11
53:25 62:10	58:19 61:7,9	brief 10:8 28:16	categories 10:19	Chief 3:3,7 28:3
backing 35:7	beneficiary's	32:15 54:19,21	13:16,17,17	28:7 57:5
barrier 43:16	4:24 6:7,8	55:6,6	14:16 56:8,9	60:14 61:2
based 17:21	22:11 23:16	bring 6:11,23	56:14 58:10	62:13,21
46:9	35:23	brings 40:6	category 3:13	child 3:24 4:17
basic 46:6	benefit 7:21	broad 19:6 30:1	8:5 10:18 13:8	6:4,5,6,7,21
basically 15:25	12:19 19:22	49:9 50:17	13:18,21 15:16	7:18,18,24,24
19:2 26:10	27:9 29:14	broader 58:21	16:3,9 20:3,7	12:21,22,25
27:7 52:2	46:2 47:2	59:9	20:20 23:21,24	13:25 14:1,4,6
61:15	48:25 49:2,11	broadly 17:3	31:6 32:10	14:11 23:17
basis 56:2	59:11,17	brother 39:17	37:2 40:8,9	26:21 27:6,9
battered 26:9	benefits 27:3	40:13,22 41:4	43:7,9,22 44:5	27:18 31:18,20
27:7	29:15,23 47:4	Brown 30:5	45:13 51:13	31:25 32:11,12
becoming 18:11	50:16 55:4	45:20 50:15	54:7 56:18,18	32:16 33:2,19
23:4	best 10:9 12:10	Builders 30:10	59:21,22,22	35:22 36:1
bedrock 29:4	23:7 46:13,14	bumped 3:25	caught 19:6	38:23 40:8
began 28:9	better 56:25	bunch 33:7	cause 26:5	43:11,12 44:22
beginning 21:11	60:8 61:12	burden 57:11	celebrating 23:3	45:16
56:7	BIA 29:25 43:18		certain 8:22	child's 33:22,24
behalf 1:19,21	43:19 47:20	C	21:14 26:4	children 8:16,19
2:4,7,10 3:6	51:22 56:20,24	C 1:20 2:1,6 3:1	59:20	34:2,9 48:21
7:17 28:6 57:8	57:4	28:5	certainly 33:17	55:20 56:12,22
60:12	big 25:24	calculate 40:2	35:5 36:8	60:8
belief 24:8	bigger 9:5	calculated 57:25	46:20 51:13	choice 46:12
beneficiaries	biologically 23:2	calculation 36:2	54:3 57:4	choose 19:10

chooses 37:20	14:15 17:19	conjunctive	43:5,14,20,20	37:24 45:20
chose 47:15	18:5 31:8,9	54:10	44:2,7,9 45:3	46:13,23 48:12
Circuit 45:8	56:10	consent 31:23	46:3 47:5	48:16,20 49:6
47:15 51:3,5	comma 28:20,20	32:1,4,18	48:21 52:16,20	49:25 50:2
Circuit's 51:20	28:22 29:2,16	consistent 25:11	54:16,18 55:1	54:22 55:6,24
circumstance	29:17,23 30:2	49:8 50:17	55:8 57:17,18	56:2,20
16:15	45:4 47:7	consistently	58:7,20 59:5	cover 30:21
circumstances	48:10 49:7,9	48:11	59:12 60:20,21	covered 11:21
25:22	50:16 53:5	consists 28:19	61:21 62:10,19	12:18 51:19
CIS 39:10 54:22	57:21	28:19	convert 13:21	covers 47:3
cite 30:12 47:11	committed	constantly 52:6	21:6 32:8	creation 3:11
cites 32:2,15	21:14 33:10	construction	61:17	credit 4:17,21
citizen 18:9	common 31:4	30:5	converted 7:4	crimes 21:14
33:19 34:17	45:21 48:8	constructively	14:7 23:20	criteria 39:12
39:17 52:1	complete 10:10	43:4	32:25 37:3,16	criterion 28:22
57:3 59:3	26:21	consular 22:5	38:3 45:13	28:23
61:18	completely 4:24	41:8,10 54:24	49:16 53:10	critical 24:7
citizens 5:21	36:21	58:14	54:7 55:23	critically 15:10
13:19	complicated	consulate 39:9	58:10 61:16	crosses 5:1
CITIZENSHIP	57:13	42:4	converting 36:5	Cuellar 1:8 3:4
1:4	comply 30:15	contemplates	converts 43:11	48:1
claim 29:21	component 9:5	29:2	43:21	current 6:2,8
30:12 35:19	conceived 5:7	contend 29:1	convince 48:16	14:15 35:12
classification	concern 24:9	contending	copy 9:23 10:5	37:22 39:5
43:24	25:13,18	54:15	12:13	40:1,5 52:5
clause 29:9 45:4	conclusion 24:8	context 7:4	corner 13:2	currently 14:19
47:2,7 57:21	confused 61:11	16:18 30:17	correct 7:9 14:9	cut 17:5
58:6 59:11	confusing 46:11	51:15 59:13	16:11 26:12	
clear 24:9 29:9	46:18,22,23	contexts 16:17	44:18 59:3	D
45:5 46:25	Congress 9:6,17	continuous	correctly 35:1	d 3:1 27:12
48:9	13:3,10,16,18	52:11	counsel 28:3	38:19
clearly 30:14	14:12,25 15:13	contradictory	57:5 62:21	D.C 1:10,18
44:12 47:5	15:15,16,18,21	30:14	count 6:6 12:22	date 6:2,8 14:2,6
48:7,22 55:3	15:23,25 16:25	contrary 30:4	12:25	14:24 22:9,10
62:18	17:2 24:10	conversion 3:12	country 5:2 6:19	22:12,16,17
codify 47:18	25:13,17,19,24	8:4 13:8,12	6:22 17:17,19	23:5,16 36:12
come 6:23 10:10	26:10,23 27:1	15:20,24 16:2	39:9,10 40:23	36:13,15,16,25
17:11,24 31:12	27:5 29:16	16:8 20:4,5,19	couple 4:22	37:7,8,10,12
31:18 33:2,8	38:14 45:3,22	21:25 22:7,22	25:16 27:6	38:7,11,23
40:8 45:12	45:25 46:5,10	26:8,19 27:4	31:14	47:5 48:25
58:3,23 59:1,3	46:16 47:12,17	27:24 29:23	course 39:15	49:15 52:4
59:20	48:5,10 49:12	30:21,23 31:1	48:18	53:14 55:2
comes 14:6	50:18 51:6	31:5 32:9	court 1:1,14 3:8	56:1 57:25
31:25 52:12	Congress's	33:25 35:4,8	16:15 28:8,11	60:2,10,15,16
comfortable	25:12,18	35:20 36:24	28:15 29:5,11	60:17,21,23,24
40:12	congressional	37:14 38:7,10	29:22 30:2,6,9	60:25 61:9,14
coming 6:19,21	16:11	38:13 42:13	30:12,17 37:20	61:22
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

_	l	l		
dates 14:15,18	17:22 39:9	20:17 22:9	E	ESQ 1:17,20 2:3
59:14	52:5	30:13,13 31:6	E 2:1 3:1,1	2:6,9
daughter 36:6	Department's	31:10 41:2	earlier 12:16,24	essentially 22:4
daughters 13:20	10:12	43:7 44:4,5	19:17 26:1	et 1:5,8 39:22
day 51:1	depend 14:14	46:11 49:14	47:16	evaluate 22:11
days 24:17	50:20	51:13 60:12	easier 39:14	evaluated 21:11
25:16 38:25	depending 35:15	difficulty 36:8	easily 47:6	evaluating 23:15
de 1:8 3:4 48:1	56:11	Direct 34:21	easy 31:19 47:14	evaluation 22:6
deal 5:19	depends 4:6	direction 17:6	47:18	event 7:5,6
debate 25:16	29:22	directions 46:12	effect 3:24 15:3	22:21
December 1:11	derivative 3:19	directly 18:21	61:8	everybody 3:25
decide 56:13	4:20,24 5:2,5	29:17	either 19:25	10:3 51:19
decision 21:24	6:13,17,24	DIRECTOR 1:3	23:17 53:17	52:3 54:14,18
22:24 25:11	7:19 8:1,9,14	disagree 55:15	55:8,9 56:1	58:9 59:18
62:18	12:19 18:6	disagrees 37:24	ELAINE 1:17	exactly 7:10
deemed 31:6	19:1,18,21	55:24	2:3,9 3:5 57:7	13:4,9,25 17:9
43:6 44:16	22:3,11 23:15	discussed 8:7	eligibility 23:25	26:24 27:22
59:11	29:3,9,18	59:24	28:21,23 29:14	30:3 35:6
defences 51:6	34:21,22 38:18	discussing 12:15	39:11	61:25 62:4,9
defend 36:24	41:17 45:5,10	12:23	emigrate 48:2	example 5:9
37:4	47:3,24 59:15	disfavored 28:12	empirical 9:11	6:16 39:14
Defenders 30:11	60:6 61:7,9	displace 17:4	9:12	47:14 59:12
defer 51:2	derivative's 4:23	displacing 3:16	employment	excuse 5:8
deference 16:14	derivatives	dispute 29:4	60:12	existing 3:12 8:4
16:14,16 22:18	10:17,17,19	51:14 53:5	employment-b	9:19 20:20
51:5 57:12,14	11:14 26:19	disputed 39:6	7:11	26:3 47:18
deferred 49:20	34:7,8 53:6	disputing 21:23	enactment 54:12	58:17,18 59:7
defined 44:7	58:17	disruption 26:5	ensure 27:7	expectation
defines 53:5	described 8:3	disruptive 15:8	34:16	18:15
definition 6:5	26:1	diversity 59:13	entire 18:24	experience 19:2
definitional	destabilization	59:13,15	entirely 50:20	explain 25:5
59:16	16:22 17:7	diversity-based	entitle 18:10	explained 62:4
delay 24:18	25:25	7:12	19:25,25	express 54:1
delays 24:10	destabilizing	doing 9:18 13:13	entitled 4:21 6:9	expressed 53:19
25:18	3:16	25:20,24 26:2	14:25 16:14	extent 17:1
delegate 45:23	detailed 44:8	26:4 36:2	22:18 23:9	extremely 15:7
46:7,16	determination	38:16 46:8	27:3 34:18	F
deliberate 47:9	23:1 33:24	54:25	48:21,24 52:2	-
deliberately	37:21 38:1,2,4	door 30:18	54:15 57:14	f 5:11,12,21,24
47:14	39:4 52:15	double 29:6	58:6	8:14,15,15
delicate 16:19	determine 38:17	drawn 16:19	entitlement 18:4	53:6
demonstrates	determined	56:21	entitling 18:21	f)s 8:14
24:9	29:19	drew 56:24	envision 17:18	F2A 7:16,23 8:1
deny 41:23	difference 4:1,4	duties 29:15	27:13	8:9,23 10:1,17 10:20,20 11:13
denying 54:17	51:16	duty 49:17,17	equities 18:2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Department	different 4:22	dysjunctive	especially 29:12	11:13,15,17,19 12:14,18,19
1:18 11:23,24	14:16 15:13	54:10	46:15	12.14,10,19
	<u>'</u>	•	•	•

13:11 14:5,17	files 14:1,4	former 3:19 14:3	global 10:25	good 13:3 25:2
19:21 27:19	39:20	formula 29:19	glossary 44:8,8	27:10
	filing 30:24	36:3 38:17	go 12:12 14:17	gotten 52:8
47:13 54:14	44:24 54:19	forth 28:17,21	19:14 21:8	government
56:18 58:17	55:8 60:25	28:22 29:15,15	27:16 31:12	24:24 28:9,11
	filling 45:25	30:2	35:18,21 40:6	28:25 32:2,15
	find 19:13 50:22	found 46:24	41:9 45:6,10	35:3,19 36:13
′ ′	fine 13:22 40:5	foundational	48:3 56:17	36:23 43:8,13
′	finish 32:24	46:1	58:13 62:10	44:4 45:9
36:5 42:17,19	62:13,14	four 57:6	goes 29:6 40:5	47:12 48:15
	first 4:22 6:15	frankly 50:22	42:1,4 47:13	50:9 51:14
56:18,22	7:10 10:16	freeze 17:13	going 4:7,10 6:2	53:23 54:8,11
F3 13:19 18:6	11:13 14:12	front 4:15 5:13	6:11 9:21	54:15,21 55:5
19:1	31:16 32:12	6:1 15:2 17:11	11:13 16:9,22	55:19 57:11
F4 18:6 19:1	35:23 36:20	17:19,25 18:5	17:23,25 18:3	government's
39:20	38:21,22 40:13	37:4 48:9	18:19 26:5,6	28:16 29:21
face 16:5	40:14 43:18	FTC 30:5 50:15	30:5 32:23	30:8 56:16
faced 30:13	53:9 58:5	full 11:22 47:7	36:16 40:9,23	grandchildren
	53.9 58.5 fix 48:6,7	function 35:9	41:6 50:23	8:16 13:19
	Fleming 1:20	functions 13:14	51:8,20 52:16	18:13
50:8	2:6 28:4,5,7	fundamentally	56:17,25 57:24	
fairly 25:14	30:23 31:4,14	51:24	58:5 59:11,16	grandparent 21:21
falls 43:23	31:24 32:5,9	further 51:10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	32:21,23 33:16	future 37:16	60:23,25 GOLDBERG	granted 39:22 61:17
family 3:21 10:19 48:2	,	61:10	27:22	
	34:4,7,10,14 34:22 35:5	01:10		ground 31:4
family-sponso 3:13 13:15		G	Goldenberg	group 9:20
	36:10,18 37:9	$\overline{\mathbf{G}}$ 3:1	1:17 2:3,9 3:5	47:11 51:19
18:10,21	37:13 39:15	gap 23:24 45:25	3:7 4:3,9,12,19	53:5,5 56:21
far 25:14 40:11	40:18,21 41:1	general 1:18	5:17,20,23 7:3	guess 24:23 40:9
54:24 57:10	41:4,8,12,16	11:11 46:21	7:13,20,22	guidance 54:22
favor 47:12	41:21 42:8,11	generate 24:25	8:25 9:13,24	H
FBA 58:9	42:16,20,22	getting 5:13 6:1	10:4,7 11:12	h 7:8 22:23 23:1
Fifth 47:15	43:4 44:18,21	23:13 25:21	11:17,21 12:7	23:4,9 25:20
figure 23:19	45:2 46:20	GINSBURG	14:9,13,22	26:8,24,24,25
file 31:3,22 33:9	49:23 50:3,7		15:7,11 16:4	
33:18 35:13,23	51:4,24 53:1,7	3:23 4:7,10,16 Ginsburg's 56:7	16:12 18:18	27:4,5,15 28:18 29:19
42:6 43:1,24	53:11,16,22	O	19:11,16 20:9	
52:2,11 54:16	54:3,8,11	give 5:9 8:10	20:15 21:1,4	44:10 45:7,9
54:23 55:5,19	55:11,15	9:11,15 10:25	22:20 24:13	49:1 56:15,17
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	floor 17:4	11:10 25:1	25:3 26:13,16	h)2 59:16
	flow 50:23	27:24 50:21	26:18 27:1,5	H1 36:2 38:6,16
	flows 44:25	given 10:9 22:19	28:1 36:20	39:1
	fluid 56:10	32:11 39:23	57:6,7,9 58:12	H1(a) 38:21
′	focus 51:9	44:9 50:19	58:16,25 59:4	H1(b) 38:22
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	follow 8:11	gives 7:8 12:9	60:18 61:4,13	H3 38:7,10,15
54:17,21 55:17	follows 15:14	22:9,10 29:11	61:20,25 62:4	half 11:24
· ·				
· ·	footnote 10:9	32:4	62:9,15	happen 7:6 22:7

				00
32:1,9,17 35:1	9:13 12:7	45:16 46:7,21	51:10	3:7,23 4:7,10
35:2 36:25	22:21 24:13	impediment	internal 57:15	4:16 5:15,18
37:15 38:1,7	26:13 40:13,18	33:4	internally 50:10	5:22 7:1,7,15
38:11 41:9,22	51:9 57:9 59:4	implementable	interpret 7:1	7:21 8:10,11
45:17 50:23	61:13 62:15	55:3	24:24 37:20	9:2,4,21,25
51:13 52:17,22	Honor's 42:14	implication	interpretation	10:6,24 11:10
happened 13:16	hopelessly 50:10	59:25	3:14 8:24 11:4	11:15,19 12:4
18:7 21:15	hostility 48:14	important 15:10	15:4 17:8 19:7	12:11,16 13:23
47:22 48:4	hunch 15:25	16:6 29:12	30:18 60:7	14:10,20 15:5
happening 42:3	hundreds 17:21	45:21 50:3	interpreted 3:10	15:11 16:10
happens 33:24	hurt 16:20	importantly	9:18 23:7	18:14 19:4,13
34:1,12 35:10	husband 48:2	28:25	interpreting	20:2,13,23
37:21,22 38:13	hypothesis	impossibility	37:17	21:2 22:14
39:6,6 41:21	15:13	36:9	interstitial 45:24	24:3,14 26:7
42:2 51:10,15	hypothetical	impossible 16:2	interview 22:5,6	26:14,17,23
51:25 52:15,18	31:16 32:25	43:14 54:9	interviewed	27:2,20,23
hard 19:9 50:22		INA 44:8	22:4	28:3,7 30:20
59:14	I	inactive 49:3	involve 44:4,6	31:2,7,15,22
harmonious	idea 8:10 9:2,2	include 7:2	irrespective	32:3,6,7,20,21
28:13 29:6,8	9:11 11:3	includes 15:23	46:16	32:22 33:6,17
30:7 37:17	18:18 20:3	29:3	irretrievable	34:2,5,8,10,11
harmoniously	40:4 57:15,20	including 10:20	48:14	34:12,21,25
48:12,24 50:13	62:11,16	39:12	IRS 8:12	35:5 36:10,18
hear 3:3	identified 60:22	incompatible	issuance 34:13	37:6,11 39:13
heard 45:17	identity 44:1,10	30:1	issue 20:21,22	39:16 40:16,19
50:5	ignore 33:13	inconsistency	21:5 29:13	40:25 41:3,7
hearing 4:2	ignored 33:18	57:16	35:6 46:24,25	41:11,15,18
heavy 57:11	imaginary 40:16	inconsistent	59:24	42:5,9,15,18
help 39:19	Imagine 39:16	50:10	issued 54:22	42:21,24 43:3
helped 16:20	immediate 7:2	independent	58:11	44:11,15,19,25
henceforward	immediately	48:19 49:11,13	issues 45:19	45:14 46:9,21
54:23	37:15,18,19	53:15,21	it'll 4:1	49:19,24 50:4
hermetically	41:5	indicated 45:20	- J	50:5,20 51:5
56:14	immigrant	47:17		51:18 52:24
higher 14:21	25:25 36:15	indication 17:2	J 1:17 2:3,9 3:5	53:2,3,8,12,17
highly 28:12	immigrate 6:9	individual 14:17	57:7	53:24 54:4,9
31:16 32:24	31:21 32:11	initiate 20:24	job 13:4	54:13 55:7,12
history 17:1	33:20 44:22	inquiry 29:5	join 31:18	55:16 56:7
25:10,12,15	56:13 immigrated	INS 8:12	Joseph 39:18,22 40:7,7,10	57:5 58:8,13
hold 17:12 61:1	_	inside 34:23		58:23 59:2
61:2	31:17	35:17	41:20 42:3,9	60:1,14 61:2
holistic 51:1	immigrates 41:25	instance 13:18	Joseph's 40:3 41:23	61:11,14,23
holistically 30:6	immigration 1:5	21:13	Judge 41:12,25	62:2,7,13,21
48:12 50:12	3:9 16:17,18	instinct 9:3	judgment 49:4	K
Home 30:10	18:10,21 31:24	intending 15:16	jump 26:11	Kagan 15:11
Honor 4:3,12	31:25 36:22	15:17 26:11	Junp 20.11 Justice 1:18 3:3	22:14 32:20,21
5:20 7:13 8:3	31.23 30.22	interaction	Justice 1.10 J.J	22.17 32.20,21
	•	•	•	•

32:22 33:6,17 36:10,19 37:6 33:20 35:24 36:6 42:2,6 37:11 46:9,21 36:6 42:2,6 21:10 60:24 35:2 52:19 56:22,25 21:10 60:24 36:6 42:2,6	8:5
36:10,19 37:6 33:20 35:24 looks 12:4 meet 33:21 N 2:1,1 3:1 37:11 46:9,21 36:6 42:2,6 lose 53:12 Melvin 48:4 name 4:23 31 keep 9:17 17:15 52:19 56:22,25 lot 16:7 21:17 member 3:22 40:13,14 keeping 10:12 59:6 60:4,9 lower 14:11 met 34:19 39:12 named 42:9 5 14:24 lead 47:25 met 34:19 39:12 names 26:15 KENNEDY 7:1 lead 47:25 middle 14:17 15:1 29:24 50:25 18:14 30:20 legal 7:16 33:8 making 18:17 mind 9:17 17:15 National 30:1 kept 9:16 11:23 36:17 mentioned 15:1 21:10 46:1 National 30:1	8:5
37:11 46:9,21	8:5
keep 9:17 17:15 52:19 56:22,25 lot 16:7 21:17 member 3:22 40:13,14 21:10 60:24 57:2 58:2,19 46:14 mentioned 59:16 keeping 10:12 59:6 60:4,9 lower 14:11 44:10 49:2 59:16 14:24 61:5 lead 47:25 met 34:19 39:12 mames 26:15 KENNEDY 7:1 left 6:22 51:1 middle 14:17 29:24 50:25 15:1 mind 9:17 17:15 29:24 50:25 making 18:17 mentioned names 26:15 narrow 7:8,16 29:24 50:25 narrower 8:2 narrower 8:2 National 30:1	8:5
21:10 60:24)
keeping 10:12 59:6 60:4,9 lower 14:11 44:10 49:2 59:16 14:24 61:5 luck 23:22 met 34:19 39:12 names 26:15 KENNEDY 7:1 lead 47:25 middle 14:17 15:1 29:24 50:25 31:2 51:18 legal 7:16 33:8 main 48:25 mind 9:17 17:15 narrower 8:2 kept 9:16 11:23 36:17 mond sto 40:13 21:10 46:1 National 30:1)
14:24 KENNEDY 7:1 18:14 30:20 31:2 51:18 kept 9:16 11:23 Column	
KENNEDY 7:1 lead 47:25 left 6:22 51:1 M main 48:25 mind 9:17 17:15 narrow 7:8,10 29:24 50:25 narrower 8:2 National 30:1	
18:14 30:20 31:2 51:18 kept 9:16 11:23 legal 7:16 33:8 36:17 main 48:25 making 18:17 mandata 40:13 15:1 mind 9:17 17:15 parrower 8:2 National 30:1	
31:2 51:18 legal 7:16 33:8 main 48:25 mind 9:17 17:15 narrower 8:2 making 18:17 21:10 46:1 National 30:1	
kept 9:16 11:23 36:17 making 18:17 21:10 46:1 National 30:1	Λ
1 40.0 1 1 1 1 4 4 π 4 1 mondate $40 \cdot 12$ 1 1 0.0 π	11
key 23:14 24:9 25:10,12 49:14 minor 7:18,18 naturalization	
kind 9:9 12:23 25:14 mandates 46:2 13:25 14:4 56:11	
13:9 15:20 let's 5:24 8:13 Mandel 30:6 24:24 39:22 naturalized 5	2:7
16:15 18:8 36:12 37:6 50:16 minors 21:14 nature 43:13	,
23:24 25:24 life 53:15 manner 45:22 33:10 necessarily	
46:18 48:14 limitations 47:9 MARK 1:20 2:6 minted 36:6 10:23 14:14	
56:16 57:15 limited 10:1 28:5 minuscule 9:4 57:22 59:10	
60:25 29:24 marriage 12:25 10:23 need 26:23	,
know 4:5 8:12 line 3:18 4:14,15 56:11,12 minutes 15:9 42.22.25 43	:1
8:25 19:5 4:20,21 5:4,7 married 6:2,3 57:6	• •
27:15 31:10 5:11,12,14,24 52:8 misapprehens 54.23 55.86)
33:9 37:11 6:1,14 14:2,5 Massachusetts 15:19 55:21 58:19	
39:23 42:24 14:18 15:2,3,8 1:20 missing 41:19 61:21 62:5	
48:19 49:16 17:5,12,14,15 matter 1:13 39:4 mistaken 4:19 needed 49:4	
54:24 17:20,20,25 45:25 46:15,21 mistakes 16:11 needs 48:15	
knows 46:14 18:5,22 19:18 55:17 58:15 MITCHELL 52:21 56:20	
51:19,22 19:23 26:11 62:16,24 40:12 43:1 nephews 8:17	
51:23 56:21,24 Mayorkas 1:3 modicum 45:21 18:13 51:20	
$\frac{L}{}$ 57:3 3:4 molecule 9:7 never 4.25 5.	
laboring 15:18 lines 16:19 52:5 mean 3:25 15:19 moment 6:21 21:10 15 42	
language 12:13 little 3:25 9:7 16:10 18:15,25 20:16 21:25 43:18 45:16	
12:20 15:23 59:23 19:14 35:7 22:25 23:14,14 50:5 58:2 60	
16:1,5,13 long 3:17 10:11 36:12 37:19 23:15 31:25 60:8 61:5	
26:24 28:14,21 10:13 37:15 38:3 42:11,21 33:22 34:13 new 3·11 11 8	3:5
28:22 29:1,16 47:22 48:2 46:6 47:25 36:25 37:3 20:21 21:8	
29:17,25 38:15 52:18 57:12 51:9 60:6 61:6 40:2 42:2,3 30:22 24 24	
48:9 49:7,8,10 long-time 18:20 61:8 moments 18:7 31:3 11 33:	
50:15 51:7 longer 3:24 18:1 meaning 43:19 months 4:1,5 43:23 24 44	
large 3:19 17:10 40:8 41:16 44:9 47:3 48:4 44:12 51:21	
Laughter 40:15 look 6:17,17,24 49:12 61:15 mouth 18:16 54:17,22,23	
law 46:22 8:13 9:3 17:1 means 5: / 20:23 moved 20:6 55:16 19 59	
lawful 3:17 5:1 19:19 20:9 31:5 38:1 44:2 movement 8:5 62:19	
6:10 12:1 21:17 26:8 51:5,10,11 23:23 56:16 newly 36:6	
13:24 14:3 37:2 53:4,8,13 56:17 62:19 muddle 46:18 nieces 8:17	
18:9,12,20 looked 24:4 meant 9:6 46:16 18:12	

	ı	I	I	ı
Ninth 45:8 51:3	52:22	p.m 62:23	10:21 11:5,7	32:10,25 33:14
51:5,20	Oh 15:5 26:17	page 2:2 10:8	11:25 13:5	33:18 34:18
notably 35:17	okay 5:22 8:18	22:22,24 28:15	15:1,21 16:7	35:10 36:4
44:23	10:7 15:5	37:4 62:18	17:5,9,19,21	37:2 38:2,25
note 50:8	40:19 41:7	Pair 49:16	17:24,25 18:3	39:21 41:19
notion 61:7	54:22 61:12	panel 45:8	18:5,19 19:5	42:7,14,17,19
now-adult 44:17	old 31:5 54:25	paper 11:3	23:8 26:11	43:5,21,23,25
null 59:21	older 22:23	30:25 42:7	27:8 47:22	44:12,16,20
number 3:19	omission 47:8	43:2	54:14 56:10,12	45:12 49:15
10:16,18 11:13	once 46:12	paragraph	56:13,13,17,25	51:12,21,25
17:10 22:12	50:24	24:12	57:1 58:5	52:3,4 53:9
23:5 35:12	one's 9:3	paragraphs 24:6	59:10,20	54:17,23 55:9
36:15 38:21,21	ones 8:24 19:6	parent 18:11	percent 8:22	55:20,23 60:3
38:22,24,24	opening 29:9	21:8,22 22:13	12:5,6	60:12,13,22
39:25 40:1	45:4 47:2	23:6 31:17,19	percentage 9:1	61:15
48:5	opens 30:18	32:1,4,13	perfect 9:15	petitioner 3:11
numbers 9:14	opinion 24:5	33:21 35:22,24	12:8	8:6 12:22 13:7
9:15,15 10:8,9	43:20 45:8	36:7,16 44:16	period 18:24	20:21 21:8,12
10:10,20 11:22	51:20	44:19,23 45:14	19:2 47:22	21:13 32:18
11:23 12:2,8	oral 1:13 2:2,5	45:15 52:18	periods 17:13	33:1,3,7,20
17:22,23 19:4	3:5 28:5	57:2 58:1,1,24	permanent 3:18	34:16 43:11,15
38:20 39:3	order 30:18	59:2 60:4 61:5	5:1 6:10 7:16	44:2,6,10,14
	32:10 33:3,19	parent's 32:1	12:1 13:24	51:17 58:18
0	39:23 48:16	parenthetical	14:3 18:9,12	62:12,17,20
O 2:1 3:1	58:14,20	10:16	18:20 19:24	petitioner's
object 49:13	original 14:24	parentheticals	32:13 33:8,20	12:21
observed 47:16	43:10 53:14	10:14	34:17 35:25	Petitioners 1:6
obstacle 35:20	54:6 55:13,23	parents 18:23	36:6,17 41:5	1:19 2:4,10 3:6
52:20,20	60:16,17 61:14	19:3,5 57:1	42:2,6 52:19	57:8
obtained 18:8	61:15	60:8	56:23 57:1,2	petitions 7:12
obviates 30:24	originally 35:11	part 8:15 24:10	58:2,20 59:6	21:11 55:16,21
obviously 52:9	Osorio 1:8 3:4	24:24 53:4,9	60:5,9 61:5	55:25
54:10 55:9	48:1	53:13 55:12	person 6:3 14:10	phenomenon
occur 17:7	ought 22:7 25:1	58:5	14:23 17:20	56:9
occurrence	outcome 33:4	particular 7:5	20:6 21:10	phrase 20:10
38:14	outside 34:23	14:2 38:13,14	31:9,10,11,13	45:2 57:17
occurs 20:24	35:16 39:9	38:17 39:2	31:20 61:17	pick 30:16
ocean 9:8	40:23	45:23	person's 7:17	picking 9:18
odd 60:15	overarching	particularly	31:23,23 51:22	picture 10:25
off-ramps 33:2	25:18	16:14,16	pertinent 25:15	piece 30:25 42:7
offenses 33:10	overinclusive	parties 21:23	petition 3:11,12	42:23 43:2
offered 27:9	12:17	parts 28:20	7:16,23 8:5	place 19:14 22:1
office 40:6 41:10	overwhelming	pass 56:13	13:7 14:2,5,8	22:3
58:14	25:13	pending 38:25	20:20 21:7,7,9	plain 29:25 51:6
officer 34:15		55:21 60:3	21:21,22 30:22	please 3:8 28:8
35:22 36:1	P	people 4:6,13	30:24 31:3,5,8	32:22
39:8,9,10	P 3:1	8:18,23 10:11	31:12,20,22	plenty 33:2
	l	l	l	l

				/1
45:15	6:19,20 7:24	provided 26:20	56:5,7,19 60:1	reasonable
pocket 60:10,15	18:11 20:1	26:22 49:1	questioning	23:12,25 24:4
point 6:4,12	34:22 35:23	57:4	47:16	25:23 57:13
14:11 18:16	42:12 43:9	provision 15:17	questions 23:8	reasonably 3:9
35:20 37:13,16	44:5 47:25	26:20 27:17	quick 52:24	9:18 49:18
38:2 40:7	prior 18:10 24:6	28:18 32:2,15	quite 17:10 22:8	60:19
42:13 46:11	priority 6:1,8	45:4 46:24	54:9	reasoning 24:22
51:7 52:16	14:14,18,24	47:10,20 48:9	quote 43:21	25:9
56:8 58:21	46:4 47:5	48:11 49:9	4	reasons 4:22 8:7
59:9	48:25 49:15	54:12 57:19	R	10:4
pointed 54:20	52:4 53:14	provisions 60:20	R 3:1	REBUTTAL
points 31:14	54:6 55:2,13	public 32:17	raised 23:10	2:8 57:7
62:11	55:25 59:14	purpose 24:19	rational 56:21	recognized 48:6
port 40:5 41:6	60:2,9,15,16	30:25	57:3	60:1
42:1	60:17,20,23,24	purposes 38:18	re-updating	recommend
positing 40:22	61:9,22	43:6 49:6	52:6	28:15
position 18:25	probably 12:22	pursuant 22:23	reaching 24:8	record 24:9
20:18 33:1	17:22	pushed 18:3,19	read 21:20 22:21	records 9:16
42:12 43:10	problem 19:20	put 15:1 18:15	25:10 28:12	10:12
49:22	24:15,17 25:4	32:25 38:15	29:22 48:11,13	red 54:19
possible 27:13	25:5 41:5	57:10	48:23 49:7,10	reduced 38:24
29:7 49:10	43:22 45:14	putting 3:18	49:18,21,25	referring 23:1
50:14 60:21	47:21 48:6	26:3	50:1,12,16	40:12
possibly 24:22	55:18		60:19	regard 52:22
47:6,6 49:18	problems 20:17	Q	reading 7:7 11:5	regarding 8:7
54:4	procedure 39:5	qualifications	11:6 23:13,22	regards 51:12
pouring 17:11	procedures	34:16,18	23:25 24:4	regulation 9:19
precise 29:13	37:23 39:5	qualifies 57:22	25:11 26:10	9:22,23 12:13
precisely 51:7	41:22	qualify 3:12 4:1	29:8,11 30:3	13:6,6 26:3
55:18	process 6:18	21:12 27:14	48:8 50:14,19	44:11 47:18
preexisted 26:20	21:11 22:5	41:16 54:5	57:13,23	regulations
preexisting 13:5	23:18 24:11	58:3	reads 29:5 30:6	38:12 47:10
13:6 44:11	processing 24:11	qualifying 3:17	ready 39:7	51:11
preference	24:18 41:8	18:8 54:5	real 11:2 16:22	rejected 50:11
10:19	54:24	qualitative 11:5	20:2	relationship
prejudice 41:23	program 11:25	quantify 17:9	really 18:3 19:19	3:21 18:8
premise 38:6	proof 32:12 42:3	quarrel 20:2	24:1 25:15,19	19:24 58:18
presumably	proposition 4:4	question 8:13	25:20,21	59:7
47:8,15	50:6	9:11,14,22	reapplication	relationships
pretty 15:17	protection 26:21	12:12 20:18	41:24	3:17 18:20
26:2	26:22 27:6,9	21:6,18,23	reason 12:15	relative 33:19
prevents 36:1	27:11 33:25	22:19 23:14	13:10 14:25	52:1,2 57:3
primary 42:10	protections 23:9	24:16 29:13,13	16:6 17:10	relevant 11:2,18
55:22 58:19	protective 55:17	37:14 38:6	18:5 19:16,21	51:17
principal 4:24	proves 55:7	45:23,24 46:2	25:2,4,6 43:12	rely 27:17
4:25 5:3,8,12	provide 32:12	46:25 47:1	43:16 44:3	relying 59:6,7
5:24 6:6,8,9,15	32:14	50:3 52:25	45:14 55:24	remainder 28:2
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

	•	•	·	
48:11	respondents	Rosario 48:1	22:10 24:6,7	siblings 5:21
remember 49:5	1:21 4:5 20:11	rough 9:2	27:12,15 44:8	side 35:19
renders 57:18	24:1 28:6	route 27:16	57:21 59:16,17	sides 19:12
repeated 49:12	48:20 55:20	rule 29:4	see 7:9 10:13	significant 17:13
reply 10:8 32:15	57:10,15,23	ruled 3:10 21:24	15:5 21:12	simpler 10:1
54:21 55:6	59:24,25 60:7	23:11	28:18 37:2	simply 62:17
report 25:15	61:20	run 59:19	52:7 53:12	single 17:20 29:7
represents 10:17	response 56:6,6		59:14	sits 39:8,10
10:18	responsible	S	seeking 51:4,6	sitting 36:7
require 30:24	11:24	S 2:1 3:1	self-conscious	situation 7:23
54:13	rest 23:18	satisfied 28:24	46:17	12:23 16:13
required 13:6	result 7:6 13:9	30:9	self-petitioner	27:14 30:10
21:7 29:24	17:8	saying 25:23	27:14,18	31:17 32:19,25
54:16 57:16	retain 53:14	26:10 32:3,5	self-petitioners	41:1 45:17
requirements	54:6 55:2,13	34:25 36:2	26:19	58:4 61:4
33:13,21 34:20	60:17,20 61:3	49:24 54:22	send 24:25 25:7	situations 8:3
requires 28:14	retained 56:1	58:8,9	52:10 53:25	27:24 43:7
37:25	retains 49:14	says 6:20 22:22	sense 6:24 12:9	57:24
requiring 55:19	retention 46:3	23:13 30:6	23:3 25:23	size 8:22
reserve 28:1	47:5 48:25	35:3 36:14	45:22 48:8	slightly 8:2
residence 3:18	49:10 59:24	38:6,9 39:1,2	55:14	small 15:16 26:2
resident 5:1 6:11	61:22	42:4 43:20	sentence 28:19	smooth 23:23
7:16 12:1 14:3	right 5:13 7:15	45:6 49:17	28:19 29:7,8	smoothly 13:15
18:9,12,20	7:17,20 11:2	53:9,13 56:24	62:14	snapshot 6:18
19:25 32:13	11:19,20 12:4	60:16 62:19	separate 20:22	Solicitor 1:17
33:8,21 34:17	14:3,11,20	Scalia 5:15,18	21:18,22 23:8	solve 47:21
35:25 36:6,17	15:2 16:4	5:22 11:10	55:3,9 62:1	somebody 6:3
41:5 42:2,6	19:14,17 20:1	16:10 31:7,15	separated 18:23	52:9 59:7 60:1
52:19 57:1,2	24:19,22 33:7	31:22 32:3,6,7	28:20	60:11
58:2,20 59:6	33:11,15,16	44:15,19,25	separation 19:2	someone's 21:21
60:5,9 61:6	35:6 36:7,13	45:14 49:19,24	19:5	21:22
residents 13:24	36:17,21 37:7	50:4,5,20 51:6	series 10:14	son 36:5 39:18
56:23	37:8,10,12	53:3 54:4,9,13	SERVICES 1:5	39:22 40:22
resolved 28:11	38:4 39:16,20	55:7,12,16	set 8:17,21,22	41:14
56:4	40:4,11,11,18	60:1	9:5 12:19	sons 13:20
respect 10:7,14	40:20 41:3,14	scheme 3:15,16	28:16 29:15,15	soon 20:6
15:20 21:5	41:15,18 42:4	scope 7:8 29:14	30:2 47:7	sooner 38:1
25:9 42:16	42:21 44:17	30:2 47:7	sets 28:21,22	sorry 4:9 5:17
53:20,25 54:1	53:8,20,24	48:10,13 49:9	38:19 48:10	32:20,21 61:13
58:16 59:20	62:2,5	50:17	49:9	sort 15:12 59:19
respond 15:12	rights 4:23,25	sealed 56:14	setting 38:16,20	Sotomayor 9:21
Respondent 2:7	ROBERTS 3:3	second 10:18	severe 3:24	9:25 10:6 26:7
47:25	28:3 57:5	38:21 53:13	shalls 29:16	26:14,17,23
Respondent's	60:14 61:2	61:24 62:3,8	sharing 7:21	27:2,20,23
13:20 15:3	62:13,21	section 3:10	show 33:7,9 49:6	34:2,5,8,11,12
17:8 18:25	Ron 49:16	12:20 13:11,14	shown 33:14	34:21 44:12
20:4,18 22:2	ROSALINA 1:8	13:22 19:22	shows 6:16	58:8,13,23
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

59:2 61:11,14 61:23 62:2,7 21:19 22:9 23:13,23 24:1 subtracted 38:20 subtracts 24:17 separate 26:4 28:12,16 suggested 22:16 suggesting 33:12 specific 47:9 46:18 48:23 support 32:14 specifically 9:19 60:16,18 statutes 27:25 13:24 14:23 supported 3:14 supposed 22:1,2 specific 48:10 supposed 22:1,2 specific 48:10 supposed 22:1,2 supported 3:14 supposed 22:1,2
61:23 62:2,7 23:13,23 24:1 38:20 term 13:13 49:20 thousands 10:21 12:12 26:4 28:12,16 subtracts 24:17 56:12 10:22 17:21 threshold 33:14 threshold 33:1
Sotomayor's 12:12 24:4,15,15,24 26:4 28:12,16 sounds 11:6 20:7 36:14 37:8,17 sparse 25:14 37:25 38:9 suggested 22:16 suggested 22:14 suggested 22:14 sugported 33:12 support 32:14 support 32:14 support 32:14 support 32:14 support 32:14 support 32:13 support 32:14 support 32:13 support 32:13 support 32:13 support 32:13 support 32:13 support 32:13 supposed 22:1,2 supposed 22
12:12 26:4 28:12,16 29:5,11 30:6 29:5,11 30:6 36:14 37:8,17 sparse 25:14 37:25 38:9 suggests 4:23 suggests 4:23 28:3 57:5,9 6:418 12:24 14:6 17:13 1
20:7 36:14 37:8,17 suggesting 33:12 Thank 15:5 28:2 time 4:16 5:3,8 sparse 25:14 37:25 38:9 suggests 4:23 28:3 57:5,9 6:4,18 12:24 specific 47:9 49:3,16 50:9 32:16 33:9 theory 31:8 18:24 22:3 specifically 9:19 60:12,18 57:13 statutes 27:25 supported 3:14 theory 31:8 18:24 22:3 specified 13:11 30:13 46:11,23 statutes 27:25 supposed 13:23 thing 11:2 16:25 35:6,21 37:15 specified 13:11 30:13 46:11,23 36:12 51:18,18 41:19 45:18 39:25,25 47:23 specify 38:12 statutory 3:15 supposed 22:1,2 53:25 48:2,3 52:12 specify 38:12 stay 18:4 stupposed 22:1,2 53:25 48:2,3 52:12 speld 40:17 stay 18:4 step 16:21 20:16 Supposed 22:1,2 53:25 48:2,3 52:12 spont 5:3 24:7 28:9,11 supposed 22:1,2 suspicious 30:3 82:1,22 9:10 16:14 19:20 spots 5:25 61:24 62:1,3 stepchild 6:5,12 suspicious 30:3 82:1,22 9:10 13:2 14:13,16 15:9
sparse 25:14 37:25 38:9 suggests 4:23 28:3 57:5,9 6:4,18 12:24 specific 44:9 46:18 48:23 support 32:14 62:15,21 14:6 17:13 specifically 9:19 50:12,18 57:13 support 32:14 56:17 theory 31:8 18:24 22:3 specifically 9:19 60:22 50:12,18 57:13 support 32:14 56:17 theory 31:8 18:24 22:3 specifically 9:19 60:16,18 statutes 27:25 suppose 13:23 thing 11:2 16:25 35:6,21 37:15 specified 13:11 statutes 27:25 30:13 46:11,23 36:12 51:18,18 41:19 45:18 39:25,25 47:23 specify 38:12 statutory 3:15 supposed 22:1,2 53:25 things 28:23 39:25,25 47:23 spells 40:17 stap 16:21 20:16 supposed 22:1,2 53:25 things 28:23 55:5 spolke 9:17 48:16 50:11,12 supposed 22:1,2 50:23 52:14 thing 4:19,20 48:2,3 52:12 times 30:14 sponsor 3:21 56:3,19 61:24 62:1,3 supposed 22:1,3 56:16 17:38:17 10:5 11:8,17 11:21,13 12:8,15 13:10 <t< td=""></t<>
sparse 25:14 37:25 38:9 suggests 4:23 28:3 57:5,9 6:4,18 12:24 specific 44:9 46:18 48:23 support 32:14 62:15,21 14:6 17:13 specifically 9:19 50:12,18 57:13 support 32:14 56:17 theory 31:8 18:24 22:3 specifically 9:19 60:22 50:12,18 57:13 support 32:14 56:17 theory 31:8 18:24 22:3 specifically 9:19 60:16,18 statutes 27:25 suppose 13:23 thing 11:2 16:25 35:6,21 37:15 specified 13:11 statutes 27:25 30:13 46:11,23 36:12 51:18,18 41:19 45:18 39:25,25 47:23 specify 38:12 statutory 3:15 supposed 22:1,2 53:25 things 28:23 39:25,25 47:23 spells 40:17 stap 16:21 20:16 supposed 22:1,2 53:25 things 28:23 55:5 spolke 9:17 48:16 50:11,12 supposed 22:1,2 50:23 52:14 thing 4:19,20 48:2,3 52:12 times 30:14 sponsor 3:21 56:3,19 61:24 62:1,3 supposed 22:1,3 56:16 17:38:17 10:5 11:8,17 11:21,13 12:8,15 13:10 <t< td=""></t<>
specific 47:9 49:3,16 50:9 32:16 33:9 theory 31:8 18:24 22:3 specifically 9:19 50:12,18 57:13 supported 3:14 56:17 28:2 30:15 specified 13:11 statutes 27:25 30:13 46:11,23 36:12 51:18,18 41:19 45:18 39:25,25 47:23 specify 38:12 statutory 3:15 supposed 22:1,2 53:25 thing 11:2 16:25 35:6,21 37:15 specify 38:12 statutory 3:15 supposed 22:1,2 53:25 thing 11:2 16:25 35:6,21 37:15 specify 38:12 statutory 3:15 supposed 22:1,2 53:25 things 28:23 39:25,25 47:23 spells 40:17 stay 18:4 step 16:21 20:16 Suprosed 22:1,2 things 28:23 55:5 spoke 29:17 step 16:21 20:16 Supromen 1:1,14 sure 34:16,19 39:11 50:4,5 suspicious 30:3 sexel 1:2,2 2:11 sexel 1:2,2 2:11 56:11 times 30:14 56:11 50:23 52:14 times 31:2 times 31:2 5
60:22 50:12,18 57:13 supported 3:14 56:17 28:2 30:15 specifically 9:19 47:11 statutes 27:25 13:24 14:23 24:12 25:13,16 35:6,21 37:15 specified 13:11 30:13 46:11,23 36:12 51:18,18 41:19 45:18 38:4,13 39:2,6 specify 38:12 statutory 3:15 stapposed 22:1,2 53:25 48:2,3 52:12 spells 40:17 stay 18:4 40:6 33:7 35:1,2,2 55:5 times 30:14 spend 15:8 step 16:21 20:16 Suprome 1:1,14 sure 34:16,19 think 4:19,20 times 30:14 56:11 spoke 29:17 29:4,10 45:19 39:11 50:4,5 6:16 7:3 8:17 times 30:14 56:11 spoke 56:3 48:16 50:11,12 suspicious 30:3 se21,22 9:10 13:2 timing 21:22 timin
specifically 9:19 60:16,18 suppose 13:23 thing 11:2 16:25 35:6,21 37:15 specified 13:11 30:13 46:11,23 36:12 51:18,18 41:19 45:18 39:25,25 47:23 specify 38:12 statutory 3:15 statutory 3:15 supposed 22:1,2 53:25 48:2,3 52:12 spells 40:17 stay 18:4 stop 16:21 20:16 Supreme 1:1,14 50:23 52:14 56:11 spoke 15:3 24:7 28:9,11 sure 34:16,19 39:11 50:4,5 60:16 7:3 8:17 56:11 56:11 spoke 29:17 29:4,10 45:19 suspicious 30:3 si21,22 9:10 13:2 time 31:22 timy 10:21 11:6 spoke 56:3 48:16 50:11,12 suspicious 30:3 si21,22 9:10 13:2 13:2 11:6 49:3 spouse 7:17 56:3,5,19 suspicious 30:3 si21,22 9:10 13:2 10:5 11:8,17 10:18,17 10:14 49:3 10:14 49:3 10:14 49:3 10:14 49:3 10:14 49:3 10:14 40:14 40:14 40:14 40:14 40:14 40:14 40:14 <th< td=""></th<>
47:11 statutes 27:25 13:24 14:23 24:12 25:13,16 38:4,13 39:2,6 39:25,25 47:23 specified 13:11 30:13 46:11,23 36:12 51:18,18 41:19 45:18 39:25,25 47:23 39:25,25 47:23 specify 38:12 statutory 3:15 stap 18:4 supposed 22:1,2 53:25 48:2,3 52:12 48:2,3 52:12 48:2,3 52:12 55:5 55:1 55:3 55:5 55:1 55:3 55:5 55:1 55:2 55:5 55:1 55:2 55:2 55:2
specified 13:11 30:13 46:11,23 36:12 51:18,18 41:19 45:18 39:25,25 47:23 36:14 37:7 statutory 3:15 supposed 22:1,2 53:25 48:2,3 52:12 specify 38:12 30:4 22:11 35:8 40:6 33:7 35:1,2,2 times 30:14 spend 15:8 step 16:21 20:16 Supreme 1:1,14 sure 34:16,19 50:23 52:14 56:11 spoke 29:17 29:4,10 45:19 39:11 50:4,5 6:16 7:3 8:17 times 30:14 spoken 56:3 48:16 50:11,12 suspicious 30:3 seep 17:3 suspicious 30:3 seep 17:3 told 48:3 spouse 7:17 stepchild 6:5,12 sympathetic 12:8,15 13:10 told 48:3 tool 30:4 spouses 26:9,9 stepchild 6:5,12 34:9 stepparent's 25:25 15:14,15 16:4 total 10:25 started 8:18 steps 34:5 44:23 38:5 53:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 starting 21:17 stories 19:12,14 stere 39:16,20 38:14 24:23 25:3,6 48:6 48:6 starting 21:17 state 10:12 46:8 38:14
36:14 37:7 statutory 3:15 supposed 22:1,2 53:25 48:2,3 52:12 specify 38:12 30:4 40:6 33:7 35:1,2,2 times 30:14 spend 15:8 step 16:21 20:16 Supreme 1:1,14 50:23 52:14 56:11 spent 5:3 24:7 28:9,11 sure 34:16,19 39:11 50:4,5 6:16 7:3 8:17 timing 21:22 spoke 29:17 48:16 50:11,12 suspicious 30:3 8:21,22 9:10 13:2 sponsor 3:21 56:3,5,19 sweep 17:3 10:5 11:8,17 title 49:3 spouse 7:17 stepchild 6:5,12 19:12,13 14:13,16 15:9 tool 30:4 spouses 26:9,9 stepchild 6:5,12 19:12,13 15:14,15 16:4 tool 30:4 stage 21:17 12:25 52:25 16:12,17 17:10 26:22 started 8:18 step 34:5 44:23 38:5 53:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 starting 21:17 stories 19:12,14 38:5 53:3 23:12 24:1,14 treat 36:4 56:25 starting 21:17 stories 19:12,14 38:14 24:23 25:3,6 48:6 48:6 <
specify 38:12 30:4 22:11 35:8 things 28:23 55:5 spells 40:17 stay 18:4 40:6 33:7 35:1,2,2 times 30:14 spend 15:8 step 16:21 20:16 Supreme 1:1,14 50:23 52:14 56:11 spent 5:3 24:7 28:9,11 sure 34:16,19 39:11 50:4,5 6:16 7:3 8:17 timing 21:22 spoke 56:3 48:16 50:11,12 suspicious 30:3 8:21,22 9:10 13:2 sponsor 3:21 56:3,5,19 sweep 17:3 sweep 17:3 10:5 11:8,17 title 49:3 spouse 7:17 stepchild 6:5,12 19:12,13 14:13,16 15:9 tool 30:4 spouses 26:9,9 stepchildren 8:8 stepparent's 25:25 16:12,17 17:10 26:22 standard 49:5 Steven 39:16,20 T T 19:17,19 20:9 traditional 30:4 transformation started 8:18 stop 21:16 45:16 38:5 53:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 starting 21:17 stories 19:12,14 strange 26:7 46:8 38:14 24:23 25:3,6 treat 36:4 56:25 statements 17:4
spells 40:17 stay 18:4 40:6 33:7 35:1,2,2 times 30:14 spend 15:8 step 16:21 20:16 Supreme 1:1,14 50:23 52:14 56:11 spent 5:3 24:7 28:9,11 sure 34:16,19 39:11 50:4,5 think 4:19,20 timing 21:22 spoken 56:3 48:16 50:11,12 suspicious 30:3 seep 17:3 seep 17:3 seep 17:3 suspicious 30:3 spot 35:25 61:24 62:1,3 sympathetic 12:8,15 13:10 told 48:3 spouse 7:17 stepchild 6:5,12 19:12,13 system 16:23 15:14,15 16:4 total 10:25 spouses 26:9,9 stepparent's 25:25 16:12,17 17:10 26:22 34:14 steps 34:5 44:23 T T 19:17,19 20:9 traditional 30:4 standard 49:5 steven 39:16,20 started 8:18 stop 21:16 45:16 38:5 53:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 starting 21:17 straise 19:12,14 straise 26:7 46:8 38:14 24:23 25:3,6 tried 12:3 37:4 1:23,23 17:21 46:8 structure 3:15 59:23 35:7,
spend 15:8 step 16:21 20:16 Supreme 1:1,14 50:23 52:14 56:11 spent 5:3 24:7 28:9,11 sure 34:16,19 think 4:19,20 timing 21:22 spoke 29:17 29:4,10 45:19 39:11 50:4,5 6:16 7:3 8:17 tiny 10:21 11:6 spoken 56:3 48:16 50:11,12 suspicious 30:3 8:21,22 9:10 13:2 sponsor 3:21 56:3,5,19 sweep 17:3 sweep 17:3 title 49:3 spouse 7:17 stepchild 6:5,12 19:12,13 12:8,15 13:10 told 48:3 spouses 26:9,9 stepchildren 8:8 stepchildren 8:8 25:25 16:12,17 17:10 26:22 stage 21:17 12:25 T T T 19:17,19 20:9 totally 25:11 totally 25:11 transformation started 8:18 stop 21:16 45:16 stories 19:12,14 38:5 53:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 state 10:12 strange 26:7 46:8 38:14 24:23 25:3,6 tried 12:3 37:4 39:9 52:5 structure 3:15 59:23 35:7,8 37:9,13 true 14:14,16,23
spend 15:8 step 16:21 20:16 Supreme 1:1,14 50:23 52:14 56:11 spent 5:3 24:7 28:9,11 sure 34:16,19 think 4:19,20 timing 21:22 spoke 29:17 29:4,10 45:19 39:11 50:4,5 6:16 7:3 8:17 tiny 10:21 11:6 spoken 56:3 48:16 50:11,12 suspicious 30:3 8:21,22 9:10 13:2 spons 3:21 56:3,5,19 sweep 17:3 suspicious 30:3 8:21,22 9:10 13:2 spous 52:5 61:24 62:1,3 sympathetic 12:8,15 13:10 told 48:3 spouse 7:17 stepchild 6:5,12 19:12,13 15:14,15 16:4 total 10:25 spouses 26:9,9 stepchildren 8:8 25:25 16:12,17 17:10 26:22 stage 21:17 12:25 T T 19:17,19 20:9 traditional 30:4 traditional 30:4 started 8:18 stop 21:16 45:16 22:3,25 33:3 22:20,21 23:7 44:2 starting 21:17 stories 19:12,14 38:5 53:3 23:12 24:1,14 treat 36:4 56:25 state 10:12 46:8 38:14 25:22,23 26:9 48:6
spoke 29:17 29:4,10 45:19 39:11 50:4,5 6:16 7:3 8:17 tiny 10:21 11:6 spoken 56:3 48:16 50:11,12 suspicious 30:3 8:21,22 9:10 13:2 sponsor 3:21 56:3,5,19 sweep 17:3 sweep 17:3 title 49:3 spot 35:25 61:24 62:1,3 sympathetic 12:8,15 13:10 told 48:3 spouse 7:17 6:14 12:23,24 system 16:23 15:14,15 16:4 toll 48:3 spouses 26:9,9 stepchildren 8:8 stepparent's 25:25 16:12,17 17:10 26:22 standard 49:5 steps 34:5 44:23 T T T T 19:17,19 20:9 totally 25:11 traditional 30:4 transformation started 8:18 stop 21:16 45:16 stories 19:12,14 38:5 53:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 state 10:12 46:8 38:14 25:22,23 26:9 48:6 48:6 39:9 52:5 structure 3:15 59:23 35:7,8 37:9,13 47:17 34:4 48:6 tried 12:3 37:4 48:6
spoken 56:3 48:16 50:11,12 suspicious 30:3 8:21,22 9:10 13:2 sponsor 3:21 56:3,5,19 sweep 17:3 sweep 17:3 title 49:3 spot 35:25 61:24 62:1,3 sympathetic 12:8,15 13:10 told 48:3 spouse 7:17 stepchild 6:5,12 19:12,13 14:13,16 15:9 tool 30:4 spouses 26:9,9 stepchildren 8:8 25:25 16:12,17 17:10 26:22 stage 21:17 12:25 T T 19:17,19 20:9 toally 25:11 traditional 30:4 transformation started 8:18 stop 21:16 45:16 22:3,25 33:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 starting 21:17 stories 19:12,14 strange 26:7 46:8 38:14 24:23 25:3,6 tried 12:3 37:4 tried 12:3 37:4 48:6 39:9 52:5 structure 3:15 stuff 33:11 59:23 35:7,8 37:9,13 true 14:14,16,23
sponsor 3:21 56:3,5,19 sweep 17:3 sympathetic 12:8,15 13:10 told 48:3 spouse 7:17 stepchild 6:5,12 19:12,13 12:8,15 13:10 told 48:3 spouse 7:17 stepchild 6:5,12 19:12,13 14:13,16 15:9 tool 30:4 spouses 26:9,9 stepchildren 8:8 stepchildren 8:8 25:25 16:12,17 17:10 26:22 stage 21:17 12:25 T T T 2:1,1 19:17,19 20:9 traditional 30:4 standard 49:5 steren 39:16,20 started 8:18 stop 21:16 45:16 22:3,25 33:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 starting 21:17 stories 19:12,14 strange 26:7 take 24:16,18 24:23 25:3,6 treated 23:17 State 10:12 46:8 structure 3:15 structure 3:15 stuff 33:11 59:23 27:7,17 34:4 true 14:14,16,23 statements 17:4 stuff 33:11 10:5 11:8,17 10:0 48:3 told 48:3 10:2,13 10:10,13 10:10,13 10:10,13 10:10,13 10:10,13 10:10,13 10:10,13 10:10,13 10:10,1
spot 35:25 61:24 62:1,3 sympathetic 12:8,15 13:10 told 48:3 spouse 7:17 stepchild 6:5,12 19:12,13 14:13,16 15:9 tool 30:4 spouses 26:9,9 stepchildren 8:8 system 16:23 15:14,15 16:4 total 10:25 stage 21:17 steps 34:5 44:23 T T 19:17,19 20:9 traditional 30:4 standard 49:5 steven 39:16,20 take 21:20 22:1 20:10,15,17 transformation started 8:18 stop 21:16 45:16 stories 19:12,14 38:5 53:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 starting 21:17 strange 26:7 46:8 38:14 25:22,23 26:9 48:6 state 10:12 46:8 structure 3:15 talk 25:7,19 27:7,17 34:4 tried 12:3 37:4 statements 17:4 stuff 33:11 59:23 35:7,8 37:9,13 true 14:14,16,23
spouse 7:17 stepchild 6:5,12 19:12,13 14:13,16 15:9 tool 30:4 total 10:25 spouses 26:9,9 stepchildren 8:8 25:25 16:12,17 17:10 26:22 26:22 34:9 stepparent's 12:25 18:18 19:11,17 totally 25:11 totally 25:11 standard 49:5 steps 34:5 44:23 T T2:1,1 20:10,15,17 traditional 30:4 started 8:18 stop 21:16 45:16 22:3,25 33:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 starting 21:17 stories 19:12,14 38:5 53:3 23:12 24:1,14 treated 23:17 State 10:12 46:8 38:14 25:22,23 26:9 48:6 11:23,23 17:21 46:8 38:14 25:22,23 26:9 48:6 39:9 52:5 structure 3:15 59:23 35:7,8 37:9,13 true 14:14,16,23
12:21 43:10 6:14 12:23,24 system 16:23 15:14,15 16:4 total 10:25 spouses 26:9,9 stepchildren 8:8 25:25 16:12,17 17:10 26:22 34:9 stepparent's 12:25 T 19:17,19 20:9 totally 25:11 totally 25:11 standard 49:5 steps 34:5 44:23 T T 19:17,19 20:9 traditional 30:4 transformation started 8:18 stop 21:16 45:16 22:3,25 33:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 starting 21:17 stories 19:12,14 strange 26:7 taken 24:16,18 23:12 24:1,14 treated 23:17 State 10:12 46:8 structure 3:15 38:14 25:22,23 26:9 48:6 39:9 52:5 structure 3:15 59:23 35:7,8 37:9,13 true 14:14,16,23
spouses 26:9,9 stepchildren 8:8 25:25 16:12,17 17:10 26:22 34:9 stage 21:17 12:25 T 19:17,19 20:9 traditional 30:4 standard 49:5 steven 39:16,20 steven 39:16,20 take 21:20 22:1 20:10,15,17 transformation started 8:18 stop 21:16 45:16 38:5 53:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 starting 21:17 stories 19:12,14 strange 26:7 46:8 38:14 25:22,23 26:9 48:6 11:23,23 17:21 46:8 structure 3:15 talk 25:7,19 27:7,17 34:4 triegered 7:5 statements 17:4 stuff 33:11 10:12,14 20:10,15,17 treat 36:4 56:25 20:10,15,17 20:10,15,17 treat 36:4 56:25 treat 36:4 56:25 treat 36:4 56:25 38:5 53:3 23:12 24:1,14 24:23 25:3,6 tried 12:3 37:4 38:14 25:22,23 26:9 48:6 59:23 35:7,8 37:9,13 true 14:14,16,23
34:9 stepparent's T 18:18 19:11,17 totally 25:11 traditional 30:4 34:14 steps 34:5 44:23 T 2:1,1 20:10,15,17 transformation standard 49:5 stop 21:16 45:16 22:3,25 33:3 21:4,19 22:8 44:2 started 8:18 stop 21:16 45:16 38:5 53:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 starting 21:17 strange 26:7 taken 24:16,18 24:23 25:3,6 tried 12:3 37:4 11:23,23 17:21 46:8 38:14 25:22,23 26:9 48:6 39:9 52:5 structure 3:15 59:23 27:7,17 34:4 triegered 7:5 statements 17:4 stuff 33:11 59:23 35:7,8 37:9,13 true 14:14,16,23
stage 21:17 12:25 T 19:17,19 20:9 traditional 30:4 standard 49:5 steps 34:5 44:23 T 2:1,1 20:10,15,17 transformation started 8:18 stop 21:16 45:16 stories 19:12,14 38:5 53:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 state 10:12 strange 26:7 46:8 38:14 24:23 25:3,6 tried 12:3 37:4 39:9 52:5 structure 3:15 stuff 33:11 talk 25:7,19 27:7,17 34:4 triggered 7:5 statements 17:4 stuff 33:11 10:25 13:15 35:7,8 37:9,13 true 14:14,16,23
stage 21.17 12.23 34:14 steps 34:5 44:23 T 2:1,1 20:10,15,17 transformation standard 49:5 steven 39:16,20 take 21:20 22:1 21:4,19 22:8 44:2 starting 21:17 stories 19:12,14 38:5 53:3 23:12 24:1,14 treated 23:17 State 10:12 strange 26:7 46:8 38:14 25:22,23 26:9 48:6 39:9 52:5 structure 3:15 stuff 33:11 59:23 35:7,8 37:9,13 true 14:14,16,23
standard 49:5 Steven 39:16,20 take 21:20 22:1 21:4,19 22:8 44:2 started 8:18 stop 21:16 45:16 stories 19:12,14 38:5 53:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 state 10:12 strange 26:7 taken 24:16,18 24:23 25:3,6 tried 12:3 37:4 11:23,23 17:21 46:8 38:14 25:22,23 26:9 48:6 39:9 52:5 structure 3:15 talk 25:7,19 27:7,17 34:4 triggered 7:5 statements 17:4 stuff 33:11 59:23 35:7,8 37:9,13 true 14:14,16,23
started 8:18 stop 21:16 45:16 22:3,25 33:3 22:20,21 23:7 treat 36:4 56:25 starting 21:17 stories 19:12,14 strange 26:7 taken 24:16,18 24:23 25:3,6 tried 12:3 37:4 State 10:12 46:8 38:14 25:22,23 26:9 48:6 39:9 52:5 structure 3:15 stuff 33:11 59:23 27:7,17 34:4 triegered 7:5 statements 17:4 stuff 33:11 125:13:17 125:13:17 125:13:17
starting 21:17 stories 19:12,14 38:5 53:3 23:12 24:1,14 treated 23:17 State 10:12 strange 26:7 taken 24:16,18 24:23 25:3,6 tried 12:3 37:4 11:23,23 17:21 46:8 38:14 25:22,23 26:9 48:6 39:9 52:5 structure 3:15 talk 25:7,19 27:7,17 34:4 triggered 7:5 59:23 35:7,8 37:9,13 true 14:14,16,23
State 10:12 strange 26:7 taken 24:16,18 24:23 25:3,6 tried 12:3 37:4 11:23,23 17:21 46:8 38:14 25:22,23 26:9 48:6 39:9 52:5 structure 3:15 talk 25:7,19 27:7,17 34:4 triggered 7:5 statements 17:4 stuff 33:11 59:23 35:7,8 37:9,13 true 14:14,16,23
11:23,23 17:21 46:8 38:14 25:22,23 26:9 48:6 39:9 52:5 structure 3:15 talk 25:7,19 27:7,17 34:4 triggered 7:5 statements 17:4 stuff 33:11 59:23 35:7,8 37:9,13 true 14:14,16,23
39:9 52:5 structure 3:15 talk 25:7,19 27:7,17 34:4 triggered 7:5 statements 17:4 stuff 33:11 59:23 35:7,8 37:9,13 true 14:14,16,23
statements 17:4 stuff 33:11 59:23 35:7,8 37:9,13 true 14:14,16,23
33.7,0 37.7,13 true 14.14,10,23
States 1:1,4,14 subbing 20:20 talked 25:13,17 37:19,21 39:14 21:1 22:20
6:10 12:2 subcategory talking 9:20 39:19 40:22 49:25 57:22,23
31:19 34:23,24 59:10 12:9 15:9 21:5 41:9 43:16 58:9,14,16
35:16,18 42:1 subject 27:8 27:11 29:6 46:5,22 48:22 try 36:24 39:13
status 7:25 12:1 46:15 34:9 35:7 50:9 50:11,22 53:18 trying 18:15
22:6 26:21 submit 28:10 58:21 59:10 53:22,23 54:3 47:12,17,21
27:6,9 33:25 submitted 52:12 61:23 62:3,7 55:21 56:4,20 50:8,10 57:10
35:18 40:24 52:13 62:22,24 talks 16:1 22:24 59:18,25 Tuesday 1:11
51:15 Subsection 26:8 43:19 thinking 16:1,25 turn 12:11 16:24
statute 6:6,20 38:19 targeted 9:19 17:2 28:15 48:4
7:4,8 12:14,14 subset 11:4,6 tell 15:14 thinks 37:25 61:6
13:1,4 16:5 subsets 11:10 ten 39:24 thought 15:19 turned 46:1

				. /4
turning 23:3	utterly 15:21	50:4,21 61:1	16:9 30:8	11:41 1:15 3:2
turns 15:21 36:3		wanted 9:10	worked 46:23	1101 44:9
tweak 40:21	V	13:14 14:12	working 14:15	1153 27:15
two 10:4 13:23	v 1:7 3:4 30:5,10	15:1 51:9	14:19	1153(h)(1) 22:10
13:24 17:23	40:17 47:10	wanting 17:4	works 31:2	1153(h)(3) 3:10
20:17 24:2,5	vacated 45:8	wants 31:11	worth 35:7	12:20 13:11,14
28:20,22 29:14	valid 60:3	49:21 52:9	wouldn't 12:12	13:22 19:22
29:15 30:13	varies 12:7	war 28:13	53:24	57:22 59:17,19
35:15 36:18	various 56:11	Washington	write 10:2	1154 27:12
38:19,20 42:11	versus 50:15	1:10,18	writes 46:10	12-930 1:5 3:4
46:11 47:14	view 20:4 30:20	wasn't 26:5,5	wrong 15:22	12:42 62:23
54:10 55:10	50:25 53:19	way 3:25 10:2	19:19 53:20	15 5:13,24 6:15
56:25 57:2	54:1	14:18 19:19	57:16 62:17	8:19
	visa 22:12 23:5	23:22 25:10	wrongly 36:23	17-year-old 6:4
U	24:11 25:25	26:1 28:12		6:5,12
U.S 5:21 13:19	32:10 33:22	29:24,24,25	X	18 10:8 12:24
18:9 33:19	34:13,14 35:12	31:2 37:17	x 1:2,9	18-year-old 6:12
34:17 51:25	35:13 36:15	46:8,17 48:23	T 7	1800 17:17
57:2	38:8,23 39:7	49:8,21,25	<u>Y</u>	
ultimate 31:25	39:22,23 43:21	50:17 54:8,11	year 6:7 10:11	2
46:24	43:22,24 47:10	54:25 56:15	10:15,21 17:16	2 8:15,15 28:9
unambiguously	48:5 52:12,13	ways 35:15	17:18 41:24	48:17 56:3,19
21:20	58:1,10 59:13	45:15	years 4:8,11,13	2,000 11:1
unconfuse 61:12	visas 17:16,17	We'll 3:3	4:13,14 5:13	20 4:10,13 10:22
understand 7:9	59:13,15	we're 9:20 12:9	5:24 6:15 8:19	60:11
22:14 35:1	***	29:6 39:20	10:22 17:24	2013 1:11
44:15	W	50:8 62:2	18:22 19:7,8,8	204.2(i) 38:12
understanding	wait 5:7 6:14	we've 10:9	19:8,9,9,9,9	21 22:23 23:3,4
5:6 13:12	17:23 18:1	week 54:21	22:23 27:6	23:4,4,17,18
36:11 46:10	35:11 39:24	weight 50:21	39:24 54:13	29:20 36:3
undisputed 47:3	51:21	weren't 12:3	55:5 60:11	40:11 45:11
United 1:1,4,14	waited 5:8,9	wide 15:17	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	48:4 57:25
6:10 12:2	waiting 3:16	widowed 26:9		21st 23:3
31:19 34:23,23	4:14,17,20,21	Wildlife 30:11	0	24 40:3 41:17
35:16,18 41:25	5:3,11,23 6:16	Williamson 30:5		26,250 17:16
universe 11:22	17:5 18:22	45:20 50:15	1	27 4:8
12:9 13:4	19:7,8,18,23	win 37:8,11,21	1 8:14 22:23	28 2:7
unmarried 14:1	47:22 48:1	53:18,19	23:1,4,9 24:16	2B 40:9
14:4 40:10	walk 60:2,10	wish 44:21	24:19 27:12,12	
updating 52:11	61:1	withdraw 31:20	27:12 28:11	3
upset 26:6	Wang 21:24	44:20	29:4,10,19	3 2:4 7:8 8:15,24
upside 49:19	22:15,15,19,21	women 27:7	45:7,9,19	9:6 24:20
61:7	23:7,11 36:22	word 43:14 45:1	50:11,12 56:5	25:20 26:8,25
use 39:3 60:11	43:20 62:12,16	49:12 50:21,24	10 1:11 12:5	27:4,12,15
61:1,9	want 6:17 7:9	words 18:16	54:13 55:5	28:18 44:10
usual 33:6	11:15 31:18	53:4	10,000 11:1	49:1 51:21
usually 33:13	33:2 42:24	work 13:13,22	11 55:5	56:15,17
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>

		75
3,000 11:1 30 12:6 33 22:22 35 22:24 37:4 62:18 3600 17:18 4 4 5:11,12,21,24 8:15 24:7 26:24 27:5 39:18 4-year 51:21 5 5 24:6 57 2:10		